1. Dr Pusey's letter to Dr Jelf vindicating
the interpretation of the Articles in Tract
2. Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury
3. Sermon preached at Bristol for a Mem

THE

ARTICLES

TREATED ON IN TRACT 90

RECONSIDERED

AND THEIR INTERPRETATION

VINDICATED

IN A LETTER

TO THE

REV. R. W. JELF, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

WITH AN APPENDIX FROM ABP. USSHER ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ANCIENT AND MODERN ADDRESSES TO SAINTS.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1841.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Introduction	1
The Catholic Interpretation of the Articles the true one	6
Art. v. and xx. Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church	12
Art. xix. The Visible Church . . .	19
Art. xxi. General Councils distinct from Œcumenical	23
Art. xxv. Number of the Sacraments . .	33
Art. xxviii. Transubstantiation . . .	42
Art. xxxi. Sacrifices of Masses . . .	59
Art. xxii. Introductory Remarks . . .	70
Romish doctrine of Purgatory . .	79
——————of Pardons . .	90
——————of Invocation of Saints .	104
——————of veneration and worshipping of Images and Relics . .	123
Art. xxxii. Celibacy of the Clergy . . .	129
Art. xxxvii. Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome .	135
Art. xi. Justification by Faith only . .	140
Art. xii. and xiii. Works before and after Justification	141
Conclusion.	
Condemnation of the Tract precipitate .	148
Tendency of individuals to Romanism .	154
Condition and prospects of our Church and our duties in her . . .	174
Appendix.	
Abp. Ussher on the difference between ancient addresses and modern invocations of Saints	187
Illustrations of Romish doctrine of invocation still existing, from Liguori's Glories of Mary	204

My Dear Friend,

The deep interest which you have ever taken in all which concerns the well-being of our Church, both when serving her, away from your home, in aiding to form (under God) a valuable character which may be, by His blessing, of importance to thousands, and more recently, since you have been restored to us, leaves me no doubt that you will gladly allow yourself again to be addressed on the subject, out of which so much agitation has recently been raised. And this the rather, since, although you have uniformly from the first held "that form of doctrine which was delivered" to us, and wherein your mind was moulded, you have, by your absence, been detached from the efforts of those who have been of late endeavouring to restore it to others, and so also, from the imperfections, infirmities, or errors, which may have clung to any of us in the execution of our task. Agreeing with us as to our general principles on the authority of the Church, the value of "Catholic consent" as a guide to the meaning of Holy Scripture, the high dignity of the Sacraments, the necessity of a higher

standard of holiness, self-denial, self-discipline, almsgiving, than has of late been common among us, you are not committed to any thing which we have said on these subjects in detail. You are come among us, I hope, to assist, under God's guidance,—separately, yet one in heart and object, —in the restoration of a higher sense of our privileges and duties as members and Ministers of the Apostolic Church of this land.

Nor would I, by any thing I write, seek to identify you with myself; enough that we are bound by the privileges of our common duty, and the friendship of most of our lives hitherto.

Nor, again, do I wish to enter into a vindication of the Tract, which has been the centre of this excitement. That, I am convinced, is best left in the hands of its writer; nor do I wish to make him, who views things far more deeply than I can, responsible for my construction of its details. I wish only to help to relieve, if I may, the perplexity of some minds, who think principles which they hold, involved in the censure passed upon the Tract, as also the anxieties of another class, who fear lest the adoption of the principles therein inculcated, should lead to a relaxation of the mode in which the Articles are subscribed. As an instance of this perplexity, I may mention, that calm and conscientious persons have been seriously perplexed, whether they could retain their offices, as Tutors, after the sentence of condemnation passed

on the Tract by the Heads of Houses. In this place, where the advice of elders can easily be had, such could readily be reassured, that the sense in which they understood the Tract, and consequently the way in which they subscribed and explained the Articles, was not that which the Heads of Houses meant to condemn. The perplexity however would be much more extensive and embarrassing, if any of our Bishops should hereafter advert to the Tract, and, without explaining their own views, seem to countenance the general condemnation by the Heads; among those, who coincide with the real views of the Tract, are many by whom the slightest word of their Bishop would be deeply felt; and who yet would find a difficulty in explaining themselves to him ; circumstances, to which I need not here advert, have added to the distance at which a Presbyter must naturally feel himself removed from his Bishop; such persons would naturally too shrink from wearying their already overburthened Bishop with explanations, which would necessarily require much detail, and exhibition of their own personal feelings and views. "Why speakest thou any more of thy matters?" would be the feeling of such persons. And thus they would seem left to decide, as they best might, whether they could continue to serve in a Diocese in which their views of the Articles, on subscribing which they had been admitted to their cure, seemed to have been censured, whether it might not give scandal, even if otherwise allow-

able, whether they ought not silently to withdraw, and yet whether such withdrawing would not be a tacit admission, that the sense in which they had hitherto signed the Articles was an "evasion." On these and other grounds, valuable persons, whose labours our Church could ill spare, might be much harassed, if a Bishop should, by any unexplained reference to the censure of the Heads, seem to lay down that the Articles could not be conscientiously signed on the principles of the Tract, whereas such would, in fact, sign them or adhere to them, not on the principles objected to, but on such, as would be recognized by their Bishops themselves. On the other hand, I have had reason to know, that one chief fear of those who have blamed the Tract, has been lest it should introduce lax ways of signing the Articles generally, or sanction their being signed by persons, who had parted even with the most essential truths which they embody.

On these grounds, I examined (as I was able) the Tract itself, with the view to ascertain what was the amount of the relaxation of the Articles involved in it. It is the result of that examination with which I am now going to trouble you.

Some of the causes, which may have led to misapprehension, the Author of the Tract has, with that simplicity and candour which we so well know, mentioned to yourself in his Letter to you, and its Postscript. But what I wish to draw

attention to is something distinct. The Author had, apparently, two objects in view; one, to vindicate the Catholic interpretation of the Articles against a modern popular system of interpreting them, and to shew that our Articles, fairly construed, were in no case opposed to any teaching of the Church Catholic; secondly, to shew, that certain opinions or practices, which, *though not Catholic*, are to be found more or less prevalent in the early centuries, may yet be held as private opinions by individuals, without hindering any from signing the Articles with a safe conscience. In few words, that *our Articles neither contradict any thing Catholic, nor are meant to condemn any thing in early Christianity, even though not Catholic, but only the later definite system in the Church of Rome.* Perhaps these two points would be better elicited without reference to the Tridentine decrees, since this part of the question relates rather to the hope of the future repentance and restoration of Rome, than to any thing which concerns ourselves at this moment.

Now it appears to me, 1st, that the proposed interpretation of the Articles relates almost entirely to the first of these two points, on which no question would be raised, at least by none, except those of extreme views; 2dly, that there is so broad a line between any practices or doctrines occurring any where in earlier Christianity, and any later corruptions in the Church of Rome, that

there is no grounds whatever to think that the framers of the Articles, in condemning the latter, had any view to the former. I cannot then but think, that apart from the construction which has been put upon expressions in the Tract, its main, real, principles will be acknowledged, at once or gradually, to be true.

The point which I have put second, is necessarily matter of detail. The first, as I have stated it, (and it alone is of essential moment,) was, I conceive, never objected to, although it would seem to be included in the general condemnation of "the modes of interpretation suggested by the Tract."

For it would be generally admitted, except by those trained in a modern school, that any particular Church owes obedience to the Universal Church, of which it is a part; that what can be proved to have been universally received in the primitive ages, is more likely to be true than any view promulgated by individuals in modern times; that what in times near to the Apostles was universally received by the Church, is more likely to be Apostolic, than any system formed now. For myself, you are aware, I hold much more than this, and, with the current of our great Divines, believe that what in early ages can be proved, according to the rule of Vincentius, to have been held "every where, at all times, and by all," is, if matter of doctrine, binding still. But

at the least, such a principle would not be condemned by those who hold the chairs of Laud, Jackson, and Fell, or in the University of Hooker, Sanderson, Hammond, and Bull. Considering the reverence which our Church has ever paid to Christian Antiquity, the mode in which our Homilies join its teaching with that of Holy Scripture itself[a], and in which the Convocation, which inforced subscription to the Articles, refers us to it, as our guide to the doctrine of those Scriptures[b]; considering, again, the reception of the four or six first General Councils, the directions obtained by our Bishops for the studies of this very University[c], the tone which has prevailed among

[a] e. g. "contrary to the most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the usage of the Primitive Church, which was most pure and uncorrupt, and contrary to the sentences of the most ancient, learned, and godly doctors of the Church." Quoted Tract 90, p. 70. n. 10. "being warned by God's holy word, and by the writings of the old godly doctors and ecclesiastical historians." ib. no. 22. add nos. 23. 27. 43. 45. 50. 51.

[b] "They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops." Canons of 1571.

[c] "Let young Students of Theology be directed to study such books as be most agreeable in doctrine and discipline to the Church of England; and incited to bestow their times in the Fathers, the Councils, Schoolmen, Histories, and Controversies; and not to insist too long on compendiums and abbreviatures, making them the grounds of their study in Divinity."

"7th Direction which the most wise King James, (A.D.

her great Divines, it is little to say that her present Heads could not have meant to have prescribed to the Tutors of their respective Colleges to expound the Articles according to the private interpretations of modern schools, or the supposed opinions of the framers, in contradistinction to the teaching of Catholic Antiquity.

But yet further, the framers of our Articles themselves had no such wish. Our Reformers did not wish that we should be Cranmerites or Ridleyans; they did not wish to stamp their own image and superscription upon our portion of God's Church; whatever imperfections they may as men have been subject to, they wished only to clear the fine gold from any tarnish which had come over it; we have remained since the Reformation, as before, a branch of the Church Catholic; we were placed on no new platform; our Reformers did not, like Luther, form for us any new system of doctrine, such as that which bears his name; they ever appealed to Catholic Antiquity; submitted their own judgment to hers. "To depart," says Bishop Ridley, "from that the sentences of the old ancient writers do more allow, without any warrant of God's word, I cannot think it any Godly wisdom." And even Cranmer, at a very solemn

1617.) *by the advice of the Bishops*, addressed to the University of Oxford, the Vice-Chancellor, the Governors of Colleges and Halls, the two Professors, to be by them diligently observed." *Bp. Bull, Apologia pro Harmonia, S.* 1. §. 4.

moment [c], professed his readiness "in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred word of God and of the holy Catholic Church." And confessed,

> "In all my doctrine and preaching both of the Sacraments, and of other my doctrine, whatsoever it be, not only I mean and judge, as the Catholic Church and the most holy Fathers of old meant and judged, but also, I would gladly use the same words that they used and not any other words; but to set my hand to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they do use in their treatises upon the Sacraments, and to keep still their interpretation."

It were, also, manifestly, a grievous yoke, and such as it has not been ever attempted formally to lay upon us, so to tie us down to the opinions of (to use a favourite expression of a modern school) "fallible men," that we should be compelled to search up and down the works of the Reformers in order to expound the Articles according to their insight into Divine truth, and to take, as authoritative, all which, in the perplexity of controversy, may have dropped from them. The difficulty of ascertaining the meaning of Catholic Antiquity is sometimes urged by the opponents of its authority as an argument against its use; yet its language in matters of faith is clear and definite; but what a task were it to turn us adrift in writings, whose authors on some points

[c] Appeal at his degradation, Works, vol. iv. p. 126, 7.

confessedly changed their views; who had a difficulty in fixing their language, lest while avoiding prevalent errors, they should unsettle kindred truth; who were embarrassed by all that perplexity, which any change of rooted opinions, for the time, almost of necessity, involves; who were surrounded by opposing errors; were, in some degree, joined in one common cause of removing abuses with men, like the Swiss Reformers, themselves involved in grievous error, and so must and did sympathize with them, and wished to mould them with themselves in one Reformed Church [d]. If it be thought difficult in Christian Antiquity to separate what is Catholic from what may be peculiar to the mind of the writer, what a task were it to take the works of such a period as this, for the rule of our theological teaching!

Again, (as has been often stated,) we have not our Articles from their framers; the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI. were never accepted by the Church at large [e]; though mainly the same, they were still modified, when formed into the Thirty-nine; primitive and essential words of our Liturgy were then restored; our Services were then, in expression certainly, restored to a more primitive mould than under the Reformers; why then is our Church to be bound to go back to the Re-

[d] See Tract 81, p. 27. note on the origin of the Forty-two Articles.

[e] Strype's Cranmer, ii. 27, 34. Heylyn, p. 121.

formers, for the exposition of Articles, which in their present forms he did not receive from them, and whose work in other respects she reformed upon the primitive model?

The last Convocation from which we received them, was at a period (1662) when the deference owed to Catholic Antiquity, which the Reformers felt, was most fully developed and understood.

One needed not to have used many words on this subject but for a recent tendency to set up the Reformers—not as instruments only of God's good Providence in removing error, but—as the founders of a system of faith, and the authorized expositors of our belief. This is the real point at issue, of which there were other indications before this controversy arose. Men must lean upon some authority; they cannot guide themselves; they who think they derive their faith immediately and exclusively from Holy Scripture, for the most part follow human guidance more rigidly than others; the only real question is, from whom, under God's guidance, we shall learn the meaning of those Scriptures, from ancients or from moderns.

Whatever then individuals may practise for themselves, it will not, I conceive, be generally objected to any of us, as a grave error, that we hold that the Articles are to be interpreted according to the teaching of the Church Catholic. Let me then request you, as briefly as may be, to go through with me the several Articles relating to the points

in controversy between us and the Romanists, and so see whether the main objects of the Tract be not what I have said. If, even on points of doctrine or practice not-Catholic, there be a distinct line between what is early and what is Romanist, it will, of course, be no relaxation of the Articles to maintain, that when they speak of what is "Romish," they do not contemplate any thing in early Christianity; on the other hand, in what forms, as we shall see, the main object of the Tract—to shew on points, where there is a Catholic doctrine, that our Articles are in harmony with the teaching of the Church Catholic;—this view, so far from relaxing the meaning of the Articles, gives them greater stringency, and lays us under a deeper obligation; since now we are bound to receive them not only on the authority of our immediate mother, but of her, "the Jerusalem from above, who is the" common "mother of us all."

Articles vi. and xx.

"*Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church.*

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. . . . . .The Church hath power to decree (statuendi) rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain (instituere) any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound

one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree (decernere) any thing against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce (obtrudere) any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation."

With regard to these two Articles, little has been done except to combine their teaching; an Ultra-Protestant sense can only be given to the sixth Article by detaching it from the twentieth. Alone, it only *declares*, what is the *source* of the articles of faith, Holy Scripture; how those articles are to be derived from that source, is *implied* only; it stands over against the Romanist system, which requires things to be believed as articles of faith, which are "not read in Holy Scripture nor can be proved by it:" who is so to prove it, who has the power of "requiring" what can be so proved, to be believed as an Article of the Faith, is reserved for the twentieth. Only, (as observed elsewhere,) in speaking of "requiring," it *implies* that some one has the right to require; and that right the twentieth declares to be vested in the Church; "the Church has authority in controversies of faith." The same Article implies that the Church has a right to "expound Scripture" and "enforce things to be believed, which can be proved thereby;" for it were idle to say that "it is not lawful for the Church *so* to expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another," unless, within these

limits she were its lawful expositor ; or to say that "besides Holy Writ, she ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation," unless out of Holy Writ she might so enforce them. And this power of the Church we ourselves practically acknowledge whenever we repeat the Athanasian Creed.

This the Tract sums up thus :

"First, the Church *expounds and enforces the faith ;* for it is forbidden to expound in a particular way, or so to enforce as to obtrude ; next, that it derives the faith *wholly from Scripture ;* third, that its office is to educe an harmonious interpretation of Scripture."

Indeed, the Tract, so far from pressing, as I think it might, that in points of faith, or things necessary to salvation, "private judgment" is excluded, contents itself with saying that it is at least an open question ; "nothing is said [in the Article] of the *private judgment of the individual* being the ultimate standard of interpretation :" nor on the other does it assert any thing as to catholic tradition being the Church's guide in interpreting Holy Scripture, but only negatively that "not a word is said in favour of Scripture having no rule or method to fix interpretation by, or, as is commonly expressed, *being the sole rule of faith.*" So that, so far from drawing the Article to any extreme view, our friend only shews that it does not contain any thing contradicting the authority of the Church and tradition, leaving others free possession of

their opinion, provided that they ascribe not to the Article un-Catholic statements, to which it is rather opposed. At the same time, he maintains fully against the Romish error, that the faith is derived "*wholly from Scripture*," discarding only the term "sole rule of faith" as ambiguous. For where Scripture is by moderns termed "the sole rule of faith," it is used in the sense of the sole "source of faith," or the sole "ultimate standard of faith," as opposed to any other independent documents of the Faith; where the title "rule of faith" is given to the Creeds, it means the rule whereby the soundness of the faith of individuals or Churches may be tested. Scripture is the rule of the Creeds; the Creeds, of the faith of individuals or particular Churches.

Since, however, any mention of tradition is thought to favour errors in the Church of Rome, (often as it has been shewn that those errors do not rest upon Tradition but are opposed to it,) it may be well to set down some words of Thorndike[f], shewing that any reliance upon it is in fact opposed to the doctrine of infallibility, as on the other hand any appeal to human authorities is to that of Scripture being the sole guide to the faith.

"Always it is easy for me to demonstrate that this resolution, 'That the Scripture, holding the meaning of it by the tradition of the Church, is the only means to decide controversies of Faith,' is nearer to the common terms, that the Scripture is the only rule of faith, than to that infallibility which is pretended for the Church

[f] Epilogue i. 32. p. 196.

of Rome; having demonstrated, that, to depend upon the infallibility of the present, and the tradition of the Catholic Church, are things inconsistent, whereas this cannot be inconsistent with that Scripture, which is no less delivered from age to age than tradition is, though the one by writing, the other by word of mouth, and serving chiefly to determine the true meaning of it, when it comes in debate."

And a little before;

"For as I have argued, that those who maintain the infallibility of the present Church, do contradict themselves, whensoever they have recourse either to the Scripture or to any words of the Church, to evidence the sense of the Scripture in that, which otherwise they profess the authority of the Church alone infallibly to determine: so, those who will have the Scripture alone to determine all controversies of faith, and yet take the pains to bring evidence of the meaning thereof, from that which had been received in the Church, may very well be said to contradict themselves."

With the same moderation is the subject of the "Apocrypha" touched upon; and as the Author has since stated, it has been one source of the imputation of vagueness cast upon the Tract, that he did not wish to press his own conclusions, but only negatively to secure a fair liberty for those for whom he wrote, against un-Catholic interpretations, which a popular system would identify with the Articles.

It is needless to say to you how deeply some persons, mostly but little acquainted with the Apocrypha, condemn it, how they offend foreign

Churches by translating and circulating the Bible without it, how they would gladly displace it from the order of our Lessons, how they have in fact succeeded in removing it from the Bible in ordinary circulation among us. In opposition to this, the Tract states, p. 6.

> " that the books which are commonly called Apocrypha, are not asserted in this Article to be destitute of inspiration or to be simply human, but to be not canonical; in other words, to differ from Canonical Scripture, specially in this respect, viz. that they are not adducible in proof of doctrine. ' The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, and yet doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.' "

It might have said much more; and our Church, in this as in other instances, by taking up the position of the early Church, takes away the vantage-ground of Romish Controversialists. For these, in opposition to such as deny the Apocrypha any value, or look upon it as a mere human book, can easily appeal to its being read in Churches together with the Canonical Scriptures, or to passages of the fathers, in which they cite from it, under the title of " Scripture, Divine Scripture," and the like. The subject is far too wide to adduce the proof thus incidentally; yet I may mention as the result of a long and careful investigation, that I found full evidence that no other Canon of the Old Testament as possessing *plenary* Inspiration, was

ever received in any Church, than that of the Hebrew Scriptures; and yet, that the same fathers, who were fully aware of this, did, in every Church, without scruple, cite the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, as being in a sense inspired beyond the writings of any men after the Apostolic age. They do indeed use the word "Inspiration" in a wide sense, from the plenary and infallible inspiration of Holy Scripture, down to the "holy inspiration whereby we think those things that be good;" they pray that in searching out the meaning of Holy Scripture, God would "inspire" them with the same Spirit, whereby that Scripture was written; but they do not use the terms "Scripture," &c. of any other books not in the primary Canon, except the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. One or two add some of the writings of the corresponding period in the New Testament, the Apostolic age, but the designation of the Apocrypha as Scripture is universal. And herein their practice remarkably corresponds with that of our own Church; the mode in which our Homilies cite the Apocrypha is in exact accordance with, and illustrates the language of the Ancient Church; both knew that they were not, in the same sense, Scripture, as the authoritative Hebrew Canon; yet, as by both they were publicly read in their worship, so both cite them at times indiscriminately with the higher Scriptures, and under the same titles; believing apparently that, even after the Spirit of prophecy

was suspended in its fulness and authoritativeness, during the intervening period before It again descended in Its fulness on our Lord, It still continued to guide the thoughts of some in a more authoritative way than was permitted to any after our Lord came, not as an independent revelation, but commenting on, developing, and applying, the meaning of the earlier, until the Sun of righteousness arose.

Article xix.

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men (cœtus fidelium), in the which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite for the same.

This Article seems to have been treated of, rather for completeness and for truth's sake, than for any immediate subject of controversy. For few would not now shrink from holding that all the Churches under the obedience and in the Communion of Rome were not in such sense true Churches, as to be a portion of the one Visible Church. Words nearly corresponding in the Confession of Augsburg are indeed in their "Apology for the Confession" so interpreted as to seem to deny to the Roman Churches the title of a Church; for, while admitting that a society which holds the foundation, remains a Church, although it build

thereon hay, straw, stubble, it goes on to say[g], "Most of those things which our adversaries mention *overthrow the faith*, as that they condemn the article of remission of sins, in which we say that remission of sins is received by faith." Such, however, (though the like sentiments may have been and are still held by some in our Church,) is not the current opinion of the Divines of our Church; nor though our reformers borrowed, with some modifications, the language of the Confession of Augsburg, can we be any way tied to Lutheran expositions of it, which would be to acknowledge them as authoritative documents in our Church.

With regard then to the Church of Rome, to take such as rather lean to the opposite side, Bp. Hall[h] adopts the

"charitable profession of the zealous Luther, 'We profess that under the Papacy there is much Christian good, yea, all, &c. I say, moreover, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, yea the very kernel of Christianity, &c.' and that, on the very ground, that it held the fundamental truth in the Creeds, 'Neither do we censure that Church for what it hath not, but for what it hath; fundamental truth is like that Maronean wine, which if it be mixed with twenty times so much water, holds its strength; the sepulchre of Christ was overwhelmed by the Pagans with earth and rubbish,—yet still, there was the sepulchre of Christ; and it is a ruled case of Papinian, that a sacred place loseth not the holiness with the demolished walls; no more doth the Roman lose

[g] Apol. p. 117. ed. Tittm.

[h] The Old Religion, c. 1.

the claim of a true visible Church by her manifold and deplorable corruptions; her unsoundness is not less apparent than her being; if she were once the spouse of Christ and her adulteries are known, yet the divorce is not sued out."

And Bp. Davenant[i], almost commenting on the notes of a Church mentioned in the Article, alleges both sufficiently to exist in the Romish Church;

"For the being of a Church does principally stand upon the gracious action of God, calling men out of darkness and death, unto the participation of light and life in Christ Jesus. So long as God continues this calling unto any people, though they (as much as in them lies) darken this light, and corrupt the means which should bring them to life and salvation in Christ; yet where God calls men unto the participation of life in Christ, by the word and by the Sacraments, there is the true being of a Christian Church, let men be never so false in their expositions of God's word, or never so untrusty in mingling their own traditions with God's ordinances. Thus the Church of the Jews lost not her being of a Church when she became an idolatrous Church. And thus under the government of the Scribes and Pharisees, who voided the commandments of God by their own traditions, there was yet standing a true Church, in which Zacharias, Elizabeth, the Virgin Mary, and our Saviour Himself was born, who were members of that Church, and yet participated not in the corruptions thereof. Thus to grant that the Roman was and is a true visible Church, (though in doctrine a false, and in practice an idolatrous Church,) is a true assertion, and of greater use and necessity in our controversy with Papists about the perpetuity of the Christian Church, than is understood by those that gainsay it."

[i] Letter to Bp. Hall appended to the Old Religion, t. ii. p. 77.

Amid this strong language as to the actual state of the Romish Church, Bp. Davenant holds that to be a "true Church," in which men may be saved, the "pure word of God" being, as Bp. Hall says, those "fundamentals of the faith," the doctrines of the Creed, into which we are baptized. It is indeed to be feared that the Romish Communion, as a whole, has, in the loss of the Cup, sustained a grievous privation; but they who against the Churches in the Communion of Rome would on this ground press the words "duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same," should shew how (sad as the loss is) it is more essential, than the absence of consecration by a Minister, who through the Apostles has derived his commission from Christ.

The latter part of the Article (the omission of which has been animadverted on) states only, what all in our Church lament, that "the Church of Rome has erred in matters of faith" also; it does not affirm it to have erred in such articles of faith as endanger salvation. Nor, again, has it appeared clear that our Article means more than to affirm that the Church of Rome, having erred, is consequently not infallible. It says not, in the present, "errs in matters of faith," but speaks in the past, "hath erred," just in the same way as it says of "the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch," that they "have erred," which was in time past.

A recent writer[k] says on this Article,

"The Article only affirms that the Roman Church has erred in matters of faith, e. g. in the case of Liberius and Honorius; there is no assertion, that it does now err in faith. The object is to deny the infallibility of the particular Church of Rome."

At all events, it should ever be borne in mind, that the Church of Rome has, amid her corruptions, continued to be a faithful witness to the saving truths as to the Blessed Trinity, which were denied by the heretics of the early centuries, and which our Church, by retaining the Apostles' Creed as her summary of faith in her Baptismal Service and the Visitation of the Sick, acknowledges to be the substance of saving Faith.

Article xxi.

"General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God."

This being the only remaining Article on the Church considered in the Tract, we may as well take it now, although it relates only to a "private opinion" which the Author wishes to be regarded as admissible. It is, that there are certain Coun-

[k] Palmer on the Church, p. i. c. xi. §. 8. t. i. p. 316.

cils, viz. Œcumenical, which are not liable to err, and that the Article meant to take the term "General" in a popular sense, not denoting Councils strictly Œcumenical, but, as it is commonly used, Councils composed of Bishops from different Provinces, as opposed to "Provincial" or "National." And this last is plainly the meaning of the Article; for in that it says, not only that "General Councils *may* err," but that they "sometimes have erred," it does not mean to include Œcumenical Councils, since our Church receives the six Œcumenical Councils[l], and our best Divines speak of there having been six[m] or four[n] Œcumenical Councils *only*, according as they include the fifth and sixth in the third or fourth to which they were supplementary, or no.

[l] See Authorities, "Letter to the Bp. of Oxford," p. 44.

[m] The Homilies speak of "those[1] six Councils, which were allowed and received by all men," and of the last of the "four first General Councils[2]" as giving instruction even for matter of practice.

[n] Hooker, v. liv. 10. ed. Keb. Hammond on Heresie, sect. vii. and ix. expressly including the fifth and sixth. (In sect. 15. he says, "the first four or, if you will, six, or indeed any of the Œcumenical Councils truly so called.") Bp. Andrews defends K. James naming four (ad Card. Bell. resp. c. i. p. 20. c. vii. p. 160, l.) in the latter place he accepts the sixth when it agrees with the four first, [i. e. excluding the spurious Acta,] but thinks the fifth and sixth *may* have been inferior.

[1] Against Peril of Idolatry, Part II. p. 190. ed. Oxf. 1822.

[2] On Fasting, Part I. p. 262.

Thus Field*:

"Concerning the General Councils of this sort, that hitherto have been holden, we confess that in respect of the matter about which they were called, so nearly and essentially concerning the life and soul of the Christian Faith, and in respect of the manner and form of their proceeding, and the evidence of proof brought in them, they are, and ever were, expressly to be believed by all such as perfectly understand the meaning of their determination. And that therefore it is not to be marvelled at, if Gregory profess, that he 'honoureth the first four Councils as the four Gospels;' and that whosoever believeth them not, though he seem to be 'a stone elect and precious,' yet he lieth beside the foundation and out of the building. Of this sort there are only six; the first defining the Son of God to be co-essential, co-eternal, and co-equal with the Father. The second defining that the Holy Ghost is truly God, co-essential, co-eternal, and co-equal with the Father and the Son. The third, the Unity of Christ's Person. The fourth, the distinction and diversity of His Natures, in and after the Personal Union. The fifth, condemning some remains of Nestorianism; more fully explaining things stumbled at in the Council of Chalcedon, and accusing the heresy of Origen and his followers touching the temporal punishments of Devils and wicked cast-aways; and the sixth, defining and clearing the distinction of Operations, Actions, Powers, and Wills in Christ according to the diversity of His Natures. These were all the lawful General Councils (lawful I say both in their beginning, and proceeding, and continuance) that were ever holden in the Christian Church, touching matters of faith."

Œcumenical Councils then are very limited in number, and different in kind from mere General

* Of the Church, v. 51.

Councils; they are Councils of the whole Church, *which have been subsequently received by the whole Church;* and of these there are but six; the seventh General Council which is received by the Greeks, (the Deutero-Nicene Council,) was formally rejected at the time in the Western Church[p]; the several General Councils received by the Churches of the Roman obedience, are not received by the Greek Church, or by ourselves. Romanist theologians, on the contrary, as Bellarmine (whose definition of a General Council is "one[q], in which the Bishops of the whole Church may and ought to be present, unless they be lawfully hindered, and in which no one rightly presides except the Pope or one in his name," and who holds it to be "matter of faith that General Councils, confirmed by the Pope, cannot err either in faith or morals[r],") count, in

[p] The second Council of Nice was not at first recognized universally even in those Churches in which it was received, the Eastern and Rome. Only six General Councils are spoken of in the East, nearly 600 years after; (A. D. 1339,) by Pope Nicolas, a century after it, (A. D. 859,) and by Pope Adrian. (A. D. 871.) It was rejected by 300 Bishops of Gaul, Aquitain, Germany, and Italy, at the Council of Frankfort, (A. D. 794.) and called "a pseudo-synod" by Gallican and German writers from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries. Its degree of reception was owing to its being interpolated in the Liber Diurnus by Gratian, and then inserted in the Canon law; but the Council of Frankfort which rejected it, was never rescinded. See further, and authorities, in Palmer on the Church, p. iv. c. 10. sect. iv. add Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 73 sqq.

[q] De Conc. i. 4.

[r] Ib. ii. 1.

all, eighteen such; "other Romanist theologians contend for nine or ten, others for various larger numbers; those who follow Bossuet agree in principle with ourselves, that the subsequent acceptance of a General Council by the universal Church alone makes it Œcumenical[s]."

Thus then there is ample scope for our Article in asserting, that "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred," without touching upon Œcumenical[t]. The framers of our Articles were not here concerned with abstract propositions, but with matters of fact; it was not their object to settle whether there were or were not certain Councils, which God might hereafter protect from error, as He had hitherto;—such, namely, as have been received by the Church universal—but, both in defence and warning, to maintain that "General Councils" had in themselves no binding authority, nor were infallible. Were they so, our Church would of course be in error, in that she has pronounced contrary to Councils which the Roman Church counts general; the Article was also a pro-

[s] Palmer on the Church, iv. 7.

[t] "The Article speaketh of General Councils indefinitely, without precisely determining which are General, which not, what is a General Council, what not; and so may and doth include reputed or pretended General Councils, univocè general, though not exactly and truly indeed, (such as was the Council of Ariminum,) whereof I did not so much as intend to speak, my speech being limited with true and lawful, of which sort are not many to be found." Bp. Montague, Appeal, p. 125.

test beforehand against any thing which might be enacted against the truth she maintained, by any Council such as could then be brought together, and claiming to itself the title of "General," as did the Council of Trent: it remains a valuable warning to all Councils beforehand, before God has set His seal upon them. As in the case of individuals, so it may be with the Church. We know that there are individuals, who will finally persevere; but who they are is not known even by themselves, unless God specially reveal it to them; and this knowledge when He vouchsafes, He has probably always given, as to Daniel and St. Paul, towards the close of life. Earlier, He gives hopes, earnests, dim intimations, to His faithful ones, and to most, probably, according to their faithfulness; but it seems from His dealings, as though the certain assurance that any one would be saved, were too much for an individual during "the burthen and heat of the day." In like way, it might be injurious for any number of individuals, such even as a General Council, to know beforehand that they would be infallibly guided into truth; it might lead to presumption, might weaken that sense of dependence, humility, the diligent preparation and watchfulness, and the earnestness of the prayers, upon which their inerrancy depends; and yet as there are some such Councils which God has preserved from error, so there may be a certain class, which it has been ever His purpose, secret to

themselves, so to preserve; and we may hope that should He allow any Council hereafter, like the six Œcumenical, to receive the sanction of the Universal Church, He will preserve this also from error. Certainly, this case is not liable to the risk of presumption which attends the theory of infallibility prevalent in the Romish Church, since, whether the Council is Œcumenical or no, is known by the event, depending upon its *subsequent* reception by the universal Church[u]. And again, since our Lord's promise is to the whole Church, but no General Council hitherto has, or probably could, in itself[x], at the time of its assembling, fully represent the Universal Church, but would probably consist of the *minority* of her Bishops, who might be misled, and might be disowned by the

[u] Hammond on Heresy, sect. xiv. rests the "inerrableness of General Councils," chiefly on their "finding approbation and reception among all those Bishops and Doctors of the Church diffused, which were out of the Council," since this makes it the act of the whole Church. In this the more moderate Theologians in the Romish Communion agree with him. (Palmer on the Church, p. iv. c. 7. p. 151.)

[x] Hammond, ib. sect. vi. §. 7. 8. 15. "For that any Council of Bishops, the most numerous that ever was in the world, (much less a but major part of those few, that be there present,) is not yet really the Universality of Christians, is too evident to be doubted of. It can only then be pretended, that it is the Universal Representative, or such an assembly, wherein is contained the virtues and influences of the whole Universal Church. And thus indeed I suppose it to be, as often as the doctrines there established by universal consent (founded in Scripture and tradition), have either been before discussed and resolved in each provincial Council, which have sent their delegates thither from

Churches which they professed to represent, it would follow that no General Council could claim to itself the guiding Presence of its Lord, with the same confidence as we may trust that it is pledged to the Church Universal. Certainly, there would be something so shocking in the thought that the whole Church should accept an erroneous decision in a matter of the Faith, that one should think it would be a relief to any one, not to think himself obliged to aver, (as a thing certainly determined,) that Councils, in such sort Œcumenical, "may err." But, in truth, I feel convinced that, as such Councils were not in the minds of the framers of the Articles, so neither were they contemplated by such as objected to the interpretation given, and that this objection will be readily dismissed. Hammond certainly sets it down, without offence, as a pious opinion, that Œcumenical Councils would not err[z].

all the parts of the world, or else have Post-factum, after the promulgation, *been accepted by them* and acknowledged to agree with that faith which they had originally received. When a doctrine is conciliarly agreed on, it is then promulgated to all, and the Universal, though but tacit, approbation and reception thereof, the no considerable contradiction given to it in the Church, is a competent evidence, that this is the judgment and concordant tradition of the whole Church, though no such resolution of provincial Synods have preceded."

[z] Of Heresie, sect. ix. "Of such [Councils truly General] none yet ever erred, that ever I yet read or observed, in points fundamental, and therefore I saw and see no cause but a man may say, such a Council shall never err in fundamentals." Bp. Montague, Appeal, p. 123. add, more at length, sect. 14.

" Though I make it no matter of faith, because delivered neither by Scripture nor Apostolical tradition, yet I shall number it among the 'Piè credibilia,' that no General Council, truly such, 1. duly assembled, 2. freely celebrated, and 3. universally received, either hath erred, or ever shall err, in matters of faith."

I may add in illustration, that some of our own Divines[a] instance the Council of Ariminum as a General Council which erred, although in the end confirmed by the Pope Liberius, but not universally received. And herein some of the Divines in the Romish Communion agree.

" Thus[b] Waldensis expressly affirmeth, that 'General Councils have erred and may err, and confidently delivereth, that it is no particular Church that hath assurance of holding the truth and not erring from the faith, neither that of Africa, which Donatus so much admired, nor the particular Church of Rome, but the Universal Church; nor that Universal Church which is gathered together in a General Council, which we have found to have erred sometimes, (as that at Ariminum under Taurus the Governor, and that at Constantinople under Justinian the younger in the time of Sergius the Pope, according to Bede and certain others,) but that Catholic Church of Christ, which hath been dispersed throughout the whole world, by the ministry of the Apostles, and others their successors, ever since the Baptism of Christ, and continued unto these times, which undoubtedly keepeth the true faith and the faithful testimony of Christ, teaching babes heavenly wisdom, and retaining the truth constantly in the midst of all extremities of errors.' "

[a] e. g. Field, v. 51. p. 664.

[b] Field, l. c. p. 663. see other opinions, ibid.

And in this, it should be observed, that there is a drawing near of Divines in the Romish Communion to the principles of our Church, not of ours to theirs; and on the ground which these take in common with ourselves, they might, if God hereafter should give them repentance, rescind the Council of Trent, as not being a Council truly General or Œcumenical, being neither free, nor adequately representing the whole Church, (but being rather an Italian Council,) nor having been subsequently received by the Church Catholic. But they approach to us, by abandoning what is Romish, and adhering to what is Catholic in their Church, and we maintain what is Catholic and approach not to what is Romish. For it is not the holding Œcumenical Councils not to have erred, or trusting assuredly that they never will err, which approximates to Romanism, but holding that General Councils (be the Bishops present exceeding few, as the non-Italian Bishops at the Council of Trent) are Œcumenical and authoritative, if confirmed by the Pope. Rather the Romanists, in so far as they are such, disparage even Œcumenical Councils, in order to make room for the authority of the Pope. As Field says [c],

"And therefore howsoever we dare not pronounce that lawful General Councils are far from danger of erring, (as some among our adversaries do,) yet do we more honour and esteem and more fully admit all the General Councils,

[c] l. c. 31. 51. fin.

that ever hitherto have been holden, than they do, who fear not to charge some of the chiefest of them with error, as both the second and the fourth for equalling the Bishop of Constantinople with the Bishop of Rome, which I think they suppose to have been an error of faith."

And this then may serve as an instance how an approximation between us and certain Divines of the Romish Communion does not necessarily imply any advances on our part to Romanism, and may open a prospect (however faint and distant it may now be) how, without the sacrifice of any truth, the Church may, on the principles of our own, again, if God vouchsafe, become one.

Article xxv.

"These five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following (pravâ imitatione) of the Apostles, partly from states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments (sacramentorum eandem rationem) with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God."

On the same ground, that our Church did not contradict itself, it is plain that the exposition given of this Article in the Tract is the correct one, that

"this Article does not deny the five rites in question to be [in some sense] sacraments, but to be Sacraments in the sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are Sacraments; (Sacraments of the Gospel) sacraments with an outward sign ordained of God."

For since the Homilies call marriage a "Sacrament[h]," it follows that the Articles do not reject the five rites as being in *any* sense "Sacraments." They neither restrain "Sacramental rites" to these five, nor deny that these five may in some larger sense be Sacraments. There is also a remarkable correspondence between the Articles and the Homilies, in that both use qualifying and guarded expressions in speaking of the title of these rites to be called "Sacraments." Our Articles do not introduce words at random. It has then some meaning when our Articles say, they "are not to be counted for *Sacraments of the Gospel*," that they "have not *like* nature of Sacraments;" or the Homilies "that in the *exact signification of a Sacrament* there be but two," or that "Absolution is *no such Sacrament* as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are," or that "neither it *nor any other Sacrament* else be *such* Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are," or that "the ancient writers in giving the name not only to these five, but also to divers other ceremonies, did not mean to repute them as Sacraments *in the same signification* as the two;" or that "S. Augustine, in the *exact meaning* of the word, makes mention expressly of two." And with this coincides the definition of our Catechism, that there are "two only, generally [i. e. universally] necessary to salvation," the others so entitled, not being of universal obligation, but relating to

[h] Sermon on Swearing, Part I.

certain conditions and circumstances of life only. Certainly persons, who denied these rites to be in any way Sacraments, (according to those larger definitions of S. Augustine, "a sacred sign[i]" or "a sign[k] applied to things of God," or of the Schoolmen[l] "a sign of a sacred thing,") would have said so at once, and not have so uniformly and guardedly said on each occasion, that they were not such, in the "*exact*" or "the *same* signification," the "*exact* meaning," "*such*," "of the *like* nature;" nor, of one which they regarded as in no sense a Sacrament, would they have said "neither it, nor any other Sacrament else."

Nor is this, as I have elsewhere[m] pointed out, any approximation to the Romish view of the seven Sacraments; since 1) (which is of most moment) the Romanists studiously confound the difference between the two great Sacraments, which derive into us the very life of our Lord, and the other rites, which may be, and some certainly are, (if faithfully received) means of grace, "but are not, (to use our friend's words[n] of the two great Sacraments) "*justifying* rites, or instruments of communicating the Atonement, which is the one thing

[i] De Civ. D. x. 33.

[k] De Doctr. Christ. iii. 6. quoted by Bp. Jewel, Answ. to Hard. p. 82.

[l] P. Lombard, l. iv. dist. 1. ib.

[m] Letter to the Bp. of Oxford, p. 106 sqq.

[n] Newman on Justification, lect. 6. v. fin.

necessary to us;" 2) our Church does not, as he also observes, "strictly determine the number."

This view of the relation of these five rites to the two great Sacraments, was clearly stated, without offence, by the sound and judicious Thorndike[o].

"That which remaineth for this place is, the consideration of the nature and number of the Sacraments, which being essentially ceremonies of God's service, the right resolution of the controversy concerning it must needs consist in distinguishing the grounds upon which, and the intents to which they are instituted; the difference whereof must make some properly Sacraments, the rest, either no Sacraments at all, or in a several sense and so to a several purpose. And truly, of all the controversies which the Reformation hath occasioned, I see not less reason for either side to stand upon their terms, than in this; which stands upon the term of a Sacrament, being not found in the Scriptures attributed either to seven or to two. For being taken up by the Church, that is to say, by those writers whom the Church alloweth and honoureth, what reason can deny the Church liberty to attribute it to any thing, which the power given the Church enableth it to appoint and to use, for the obtaining God's blessing upon Christians? Why should not any action appointed by the Church to obtain God's sanctifying grace, by virtue of any promise which the Gospel containeth, be counted a Sacrament? At least, supposing it to consist in a ceremony, fit to signify the blessing which it pretendeth to procure. For it is manifest, that Baptism also, and the Eucharist, are ceremonies signifying visibly that invisible grace, wherewith God sanctifieth Christians. But there will be therefore no

[o] Epilogue, book iii. p. 342.

consequence, that Baptism and the Eucharist should be counted Sacraments for the same reason and in the same nature and kind, for which any thing else is or can be counted a Sacrament. No, not though they may all in their proper sense be truly called Sacraments of the Church, because the dispensing of them all is trusted with the Church.—These two Sacraments have the promise of grace absolutely so called, that is, of all the grace which the Gospel promiseth; which it is to be acknowledged and maintained, that no other of those actions, that are or may be called Sacraments of the Church, doth or can do, upon the like terms as they do."

The distinction which he lays down between the two great Sacraments and the five rites is, that

"These[p] two immediately bring forth God's grace, as instruments of His promise, by His appointment; the rest must obtain it by the means of God's Church, and the blessing annexed to communion with it."

"Upon these terms," he proceeds to shew that all the other five rites may, in their right use, "very well be counted Sacraments of the Church," and thus sums up[q],

"In fine, the name and notion of a Sacrament, as it hath been duly used by the Church and writers allowed by the Church, extendeth to all holy actions, done by virtue of the office which God hath trusted His Church with in hope of obtaining the grace which He promiseth. Baptism and the Eucharist are actions appointed by God, in certain creatures, utterly impertinent to the effect of

[p] ib. p. 344. [q] ib. p. 349.

grace, setting aside His appointment; but apt to signify all the grace which the Gospel promiseth, by virtue of that correspondence which holds between things visible and sensible, and things intelligible and invisible: both, antecedent for their institution to the foundation of the Church; the society whereof subscribeth, upon condition of the first, and for communion in the second. The rest are actions appointed to be solemnized in the Church by the Apostles, not always every where precisely with the same ceremonies, but such as always may reasonably serve to signify the graces, which it prays for, on the behalf of them who receive them; the hope of that Grace being grounded upon God's general promise of hearing the prayers of His Church which the constitution thereof involveth. Nor am I solicitous to make that construction, which may satisfy the decrees of the Councils of Florence and Trent, who have first taken upon them to decree under Anathema, the conceits of the school in reducing them to the number of seven; but seeing the particulars so qualified by ancient writers in the Church, and the number agreed upon by the Greek Church as well as the Latin; I have acknowledged that sense of their sayings, which the primitive order of the Catholic Church enforceth. For though I count it a great abuse to maintain simple Christians in an opinion, that the outward works of them, not supposing the ground upon which, the intent to which, the disposition with which, they are done, secures the salvation of them to whom they are ministered, which opinion the formal ministering of them seemeth to maintain, yet is it a far greater abuse, to place the reformation of the Church in abolishing the solemnities rather than in reducing the right understanding of the ground and intent of those offices, which they serve to solemnize.

You will well know that neither in this, nor in any thing else which I may allege, do I wish to

assimilate our language to that of the Church of Rome, or even to use that of our Homilies, when they call Marriage a "Sacrament:" it would be unnatural and affected and worse; I would (since in these days one must speak of self, and may more naturally in writing to a friend) rather use the language of the fathers as to other things than to these, lest I should seem to be speaking not in a Catholic but in a Romish sense; yet one need do neither; on the contrary, since the word "Sacrament" has been misused to place the five rites on a level with the two great Sacraments, and there is no necessity for retaining it, it were wrong and cruel to risk perplexing person's minds by reviving it; the truth which our Homilies imply may also be conveyed in other ways[r]: but in truth it is not our language, but our feelings towards holy rites, which we need to have altered; and I feel assured that a more reverend estimation and a more hallowed use of these gifts of the Church, as means whereby grace is bestowed, or enlarged, or restored, so far from placing them on a level with the two high Sacraments, would the rather raise men's veneration for these, as being so far above them. Men's real objection to considering these rites as in any degree "Sacramental," arises, it is to be feared, partly in their low estimate of

[r] e. g. Mysteries, sacramentals, see Hooker, E. P. iv. 1. 2. ed. Keble. Beza calls the imposition of hands, "this as it were sacrament." Ib.

God's gifts thereby, or of the sanctity required of the confirmed, the married, the Priesthood, or of the grievous hindrance which sin interposes to the shining in of Christ's light and grace upon the soul, which Absolution tends to remove, but partly also in their inadequate thought of the two great Sacraments. When these, instead of being instruments of knitting the soul to Christ, are regarded, in the ordinary sense, as "means of grace" only, i. e. aids to spiritual improvement, there is no room for inferior sacramental actions. But if we regard these as instruments of conveying grace, and yet the two Sacraments as so removed above them, as to be instruments of a different kind, then will these the rather take the place which our Lord gave them in the Christian life, as the appointed channels for applying the Atonement to the soul, the communication of Himself and His life. On the other hand, it would tend indefinitely to raise the whole tone of our life and conversation, were we, after the manner of the fathers, to look on holy actions as having in them something sacramental, as being, although inferior to the great Sacraments, employed, in a mysterious way, to convey His grace to us, and so as being mysteries; if we habitually regarded institutions, some of which are even now accounted "means of grace," as being such, in that (whereby alone they could be such) God gives them power, which of themselves they could not have, and endows them with heavenly virtue;

if we looked on God's part in them rather than our own; if we regarded "preaching" such, because He puts His words into our mouths, and "sends His blessing, that His word spoken by our mouths, may have such success that it be not spoken in vain[s];" or, with those of old, accounted "fasting" sacramental[t], because, as our Homily[u] says, "fasting used with prayer is of great efficacy and weigheth much with God," and "obtaineth notable things at His hand;" and our Lord says, "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting[x];" or the "Creed[y]," because its recital is not only a confession of our faith and a praise of God, but because He makes it a means of deepening in us the faith which we profess; or "prayer[z]," because it is the voice of God within us to Himself; or our "Lord's prayer," because it hath "such wealth of

[s] Prayer in Ordination of Priests.

[t] Sacramentum Esuritionis, S. Hilary, ap. Jewel Defence of the Apology, p. 215.

[u] On Fasting, Part II. p. 272.

[x] Matt. xvii. 21. quoted ib. in proof of the efficacy of fasting.

[y] "Receiving the Sacrament of the Gospel Creed, inspired by the Lord, instituted by the Apostles, of which the words are few, the mysteries great," Liturgy of Gelasius ap. Ass. cod. lit. i. 11. so also the old Gothic and Gallican (ib. 30.) speaks of "the Sacrament (or mysterious meaning) of the whole Creed." In the Old Gallican (ib. 41.) the Creed is called "the seal of the Catholic Faith, the Sacrament of eternal life." Much of the language is from S. Augustine, who also (Serm. 228 fin.) speaks of the "Sacrament of the Creed, which they ought to believe, the Sacrament of the Lord's prayer, how they ought to ask."

[z] S. Hilary in S. Matt. c. 5.

spiritual virtue," we "offer to God of His own, and the Father recognizes the Son's own words[a];" or "Holy Scripture[b]," because it has a Divine power placed within it, as the word emanating from the Word; or "Martyrdom[c]," because it is a renewal of Baptism, being a sharing of the Baptism, wherewith our Lord was baptized.

And, while this would be beneficial to ourselves and no approximation to any error, it could not fail to attract the respect of our brethren in the Romish Communion, when they saw that we denied to these rites the name and character of true Sacraments of Christ, not as undervaluing them as His gifts through His Church, nor from an irreverent habit of mind, but rather from exceeding reverence for those two,—one of which, Holy Baptism, it is the tendency of their own system to lower, but—which are the special witnesses of His Presence in the Church, the pledges of His love, engrafting and cementing the members of His Church into Himself, and deriving His life into them; those two which issued from His pierced Side, in the hour when our Redemption was completed.

Article xxviii.

"Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be

[a] S. Cyprian de Orat. Dom. §. 5. and l. he speaks §. 5. of the "Sacraments of the Lord's prayer." See also S. Aug. note y.

[b] S. Hil. ap. Jewel, l. c.

[c] S. Jerome Ep. 69. ad Ocean. quoted ib.

proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

A right notion of what is meant by Transubstantiation is of the more importance to us, because there is no more common hindrance to the reception of the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, than the confused ideas prevalent about it. Nothing is more common than for any high statements of that doctrine to be attacked under the name of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. Persons acknowledge in act, (there is reason to trust,) what they dare not realize in words. They rightly dread the gross and carnal doctrine, rejected by our Church as Transubstantiation; they rightly shrink from that of Consubstantiation, as being an approach to it; and more justly might they reject both doctrines as novel, unauthorized, and rationalizing ways of explaining the *mode* of Divine mysteries; "how these things can be." But not having any clear notions what is meant by these statements, they dread to acknowledge any spiritual unseen presence of that blessed Body and Blood, and thus incur the risk of losing much of the awe with which those holy Mysteries should be approached and received, the belief of the actualness of their own union with Christ, the reality of their being temples of the Holy Ghost, and their own consequent consecration, and the comforts which they might also have in the belief of this union of earth and Heaven, of their real incorpo-

ration in the mystical Body of their Lord, and their receiving in themselves the pledge of their Resurrection, the earnest of their acceptance at the Day of Judgment. Not knowing what Presence it is which is implied in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as defined in the Roman schools, and popularly received, they shrink from holding any actual Presence at all, other than in the believer's soul, which they dimly apprehend; not knowing what change is implied by Transubstantiation, they dread to avow that there is any change at all, but look on the consecrated elements, as remaining *simply* what they were before, and what to sight they seem. This is a very serious practical evil; and I have stated but the least portion of it; for it is doubtless one concurrent cause why many, it is to be feared, think of the Holy Eucharist solely as a commemorative rite, approach it and depart from it carelessly, or are lukewarm about it, and neglect it altogether. The infrequency of our Communions has been abated, the devoutness of Communicants (as you will yourself have observed in this place among others) has much increased, in proportion as the higher doctrines have been received.

In opposition then to these vague apprehensions, our friend has stated what the doctrine of Transubstantiation opposed in the Articles is;

"The shocking doctrine, that 'the Body of Christ,' as the Article goes on to express it, is not 'given, taken, and

eaten after an heavenly and spiritual manner, but is carnally pressed with the teeth;' that it is a body or substance of a certain extension and bulk in space, and a certain figure and the due disposition of parts, whereas we hold that the only substance such, is the bread which we see."

And a little afterwards[d] in summing up,

"We see then, that, by Transubstantiation, our Article does not confine itself to any abstract theory, nor aim at any definition of the word substance, nor in rejecting it, rejects a word, nor in denying a 'mutatio panis et vini,' is denying every kind of change, but opposes itself to a certain plain and unambiguous statement, not of this or that Council, but one generally received or taught both in the schools and in the multitude, that the material elements are changed into an earthly, fleshly, and organized[e] body, extended in size, distinct in its parts, which is there where the outward appearances of bread and wine are, and only does not meet the senses, nor even that always. Objections against 'substance,' 'nature,' 'change,' 'accidents,' or the like, seem, more or less, questions of words, and inadequate expressions of the great offence which we find in the received Roman views of this sacred doctrine."

[d] p. 51.

[e] e. g. Bonaventura in answer to the question, "Whether the Body of Christ is on the Altar in its own natural dimensions" (quantitas) argues, "The Body of Christ is living; and if living, organic; and if organic, hath dimensions (si organicum, quantum), therefore if on the Altar it be not detached from life, neither is it from dimensions," also "The Body of Christ or Christ sees them and hears, although It speaks not, lest It be discovered, but the outward senses presuppose dimensions; therefore it is there in dimension." L. iv. dist. 10. art. i. q. 2.

One may add, that the same appears from the very words of the Article itself, for it is this carnal doctrine alone which "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," (in that S. Paul speaks of that received by Communicants as "bread," 1 Cor. x. 17. xi. 27, 28.) it also "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," as being "an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace," whereas on this theory of Transubstantiation what we see would not be a sign but the reality.

The same view of the Article, that it is "not *any* change which is meant," is given by Bishop Jewel;

"We affirm that the bread and wine are the holy and heavenly mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true Bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that by faith we verily received His Body and Blood. Yet say we not this so as though we thought, that the nature and substance of the bread and wine is clearly changed and goeth to nothing."

Or to take the statement of a modern Romanist[b], commenting on the articles of Trent,

"The bread and wine after consecration are in the eyes of faith nothing else than the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, not that the bread and wine are annihilated, but because faith thenceforth contemplates there nothing but the Presence of Jesus Christ. This is the sense in which the ancients spoke of a change, but this is not that of the

[b] Courayer on P. Sarpi Hist. du Conc. du Trente, l. iv. t. i. p. 623.

Council, which teaches that the *whole substance of bread and wine is annihilated*, and that there remains nothing but the accidents and appearances. *This* was *then the received doctrine of the Roman schools*, although even to the present day many of their theologians give this opinion only as one simply probable."

The more common statement among the Schoolmen, and in Bellarmine[c], differs in words only,

"The bread is in truth not annihilated, *although nothing remains of it after the consecration.*"

It is intended only to convey the same doctrine with more philosophical accuracy, inasmuch as "annihilation" implies "not merely[d] that nothing remains of a thing, but that it passeth into nothing," "but the elements are not supposed to be reduced to nothing, but to be changed as to their entire substance," "into a better substance," i. e. the Body and Blood of Christ. The other mode of speaking, however, also occurred[e].

This, and no other, is the doctrine of Transubstantiation opposed by our Articles and our great writers; they confess fully the reality of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, they only do not define the mode of His Presence; they will not so tie down the Omnipotence of Almighty God that the Bread and Wine should not also be the Body

[c] De Euch. iii. 18.

[d] Bonav. l. iv. dist. xi. q. 3. "What is changed into any thing is not annihilated." Thom. Aq. l. iv. Hist. xi. q. 1. art. 2.

[e] It is mentioned by P. Lombard, l. iv. dist. xi. art. 2.

and Blood of Christ; they agree with Catholic antiquity that there is a change, but only not such a change, whereby (in Bishop Jewel's words) "the nature and substance of bread and wine goeth to nothing." This is the received doctrine in the Romish Church, though happily (one must in candour add) not so defined in the Council of Trent.

I need not, for your information, set down any of these passages; this contrast runs through all our writers; a real change, as I said, they gladly accept; a true, real, substantial, Sacramental, Presence of our Lord and His Flesh, the Very Flesh which was born of the Virgin Mary, and is now glorified at God's right hand, they reverently confess; they only confess not, that carnal, scholastic theory which would explain away the Mystery, that the Elements, although the Body and Blood of Christ, are also Bread and Wine. They confess the truth; the mode of its being they leave, like the mystery of the Incarnation whence it is derived, undefined because incomprehensible by man.

Thus, to take some, for the most part already collected to our hands.

Bishop Ridley[e].

"Both you and I agree in this; that *in the Sacrament* is the very, true, and natural, Body and Blood of Christ;

[e] Fox, Acts and Mon. p. 1598, quoted by Laud against Fisher, §. 35.

even that which was born of the Virgin Mary; which ascended into heaven; which sits on the right hand of God the Father; which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being. We confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I confess Christ's natural Body to be in the Sacrament by spirit and grace, &c. You make a grosser kind of being, inclosing a natural Body under the shape and form of Bread and Wine."

And Bishop Andrews[f].

"The Cardinal is not, unless 'willingly, ignorant,' that Christ hath said, 'This is My Body,' not 'This is (not) My Body *in this mode*.' Now about the object we are both agreed; all the controversy is about the *mode*. The 'This is,' we firmly believe; that 'it is in this mode' (the bread, namely, being transubstantiated into the Body), or of the mode whereby it is wrought that 'it is,' whether *in*, or *with*, or *under*, or *transubstantiated*, there is not a word in the Gospel. And because not a word is there, we rightly detach it from being a matter of faith; we may place it amongst the decrees of the schools, not among the articles of faith. What Durandus is reported to have said of old, (Neand. Synop. Chron. p. 203.) we approve of. 'We hear the word, feel the effect, know not the manner, believe the Presence.' The Presence, I say, we believe, and that no less true than yourselves. Of the mode of the Presence, we define nothing rashly, nor, I add, do we curiously enquire; no more than how the Blood of Christ cleanseth us in our Baptism; no more than how in the Incarnation of Christ the human nature is united into the same Person with the Divine. We rank it among Mysteries, (and indeed the Eucharist itself is a

[f] Answer to Bellarmine, c. i. p. 11.

mystery,) ' that which remaineth, ought to be burnt with fire,' (Ex. xii. 13.) that is, as the Fathers elegantly express it, to be adored by faith, not examined by reason."

And Bishop Montague [g], (alleging Bishop Bilson,)

" The disagreement is only in de modo præsentiæ, the thing is yielded to on either side, that there is in the holy Eucharist a real Presence. ' God forbid,' saith Bishop Bilson, ' we should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourselves withal." (p. 779 of the subject.)

And again [h],

" Be contented with, that it is " The Body of Christ," and do not seek and define how it is so, and we shall not contest nor contend, which God forbid the Church of England should maintain, said Bishop Bilson."

Bishop Forbes [i].

" The doctrine of those Protestants and others seems most safe and true, who are of opinion, nay, most firmly believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ is truly, *really*, and *substantially* present in the Eucharist, and received, but in a manner incomprehensible in respect of human reason and ineffable, known to God alone, and not revealed to us in the Scriptures, not corporal, yet neither in the mind alone, or through faith alone, but in another way, known, as was said, to God alone, and to be left to His Omnipotence."

[g] Appeal, c. 30. init. p. 289.

[h] ib. fin. p. 297.

[i] Consid. Modestæ, De Euchar. l. i. c. i. §. 7.

Archbishop Laud [k].

"His Altar, as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, (I say the greatest,) yea, greater than the pulpit. For there 'tis 'Hoc est Corpus Meum,' 'This is My Body.' But in the pulpit 'tis at most, 'Hoc est verbum Meum,' 'This is My word.' And a greater reverence (no doubt) is due to the Body than to the word of our Lord. And so in relation, answerably to the throne, where His Body is usually present, than to the seat where His word useth to be proclaimed."

Bp. Taylor again fully admits, that the terms "real," "substantial," and even "corporeal," Presence might have a sound sense, if this last be understood as opposed to "figurative" or "in type;" and that the very words of the article of Trent, "the Saviour is sacramentally present with us in His Substance,"

"if [l] they might be understood in the sense, in which the Protestants use them, that is, really, truly, without fiction or the help of fancy, but "in rei veritate" so as Philo calls spiritual things, ἀναγκαιόταται οὐσίαι, 'most necessary, useful, and material substances,' might become an instrument of united confession."

Nor does he hesitate to acknowledge what some, accustomed to the modern generalizing way of speaking, would at once identify with Transubstantiation, that by the "real Presence" is meant the

[k] Speech in the Star Chamber 1637, p. 47.

[l] Of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament init.

Presence of that very Body which our Blessed Saviour took of the Virgin Mary.

"It is enquired[m], whether when we say, we believe Christ's Body to be 'really' in the Sacrament, we mean 'that Body, that Flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary,' that was crucified, dead, and buried. I answer, I know none else that He had or hath, there is but one Body of Christ natural and glorified; but he that says, that Body is glorified, which was crucified, says, it is the same Body, but not after the same manner: and so it is in the Sacrament, We eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, that was broken and poured forth: for there is no other Body, no other Blood of Christ: but though it is the same we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner. And therefore when any of the protestant Divines or any of the Fathers deny that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, to be eaten in the Sacrament, as Bertram, as St. Hierom, as Clemens Alexandrinus expressly affirm, the meaning is easy; they intend that it is not eaten in a natural sense."

I would add one more extract on the Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, both as containing in itself several other testimonies, and as occurring in a Charge[n], animadverting upon some of the language used on other subjects in our Tracts.

"When any of us speak of this great mystery in terms best suited to its spiritual nature; when, for instance, we speak of the real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, there is raised a cry, as if we were symbolizing with the Church of Rome, and as if this

[m] V. ib. §. 8.

[n] Bishop of Exeter's Charge, p. 69—71.

Presence, because it is real, can be nothing else than the gross, carnal, corporeal, presence indicated in Transubstantiation. Now here, as with respect to Baptism, I will not argue the point, but will merely refer to the language of our Church in those authorized declarations of its doctrine to which we have assented, and in those formularies which we have both expressly approved and solemnly engaged to use.

"It is very true, that none of these declarations or formularies use the phrase 'real Presence;' and therefore, if any should attempt to impose the use of that phrase as necessary, he would be justly open to censure for requiring what the Church does not require. But, on the other hand, if we adopt the phrase, as not only aptly expressing the doctrine of the Church, but also as commended to our use by the practice of the soundest Divines of the Church of England, in an age more distinguished for depth, as well as soundness, of Theology than the present—such as Abp. Bramhall[o], Sharp[p], and Wake[r], (all of whom do not only express their own judgment, but also are witnesses of the general judgment of the Church in, and before, their days; 'No genuine son of the Church of England,' says Bramhall, 'did ever deny a true real Presence;') if, I say, we adopt the phrase, used by such men as these, and even by some of those, who at the Reformation sealed with their blood their testimony to the Truth against the doctrine of Rome, (I allude especially to Bishops Ridley and Latimer[s]—and even to Cranmer, who, when he avoided the phrase so abused by the Romanists, did yet employ equivalent

[o] Works, i. p. 15.

[p] Sermons, vol. vii. p. 368.

[r] Discourse on the Holy Eucharist, c. 2. "Of the real Presence acknowledged by the Church of England."

[s] Ridley in Fox, p. 61. Latimer ib. p. 65. Cranmer, Preface to book against Gardiner, &c.

words,) it will be sufficient for the justification both of them and of us to shew, that the language of the Church itself does in fact express the same thing though in different terms. Still, I fully admit, that Christian discretion would bid us forbear from the use of the phrase, if the objection to it were founded on a sincere apprehension of giving offence to tender consciences; and not, as there is too much reason to believe, on an aversion to the great truth which it is employed to express."

Again, Thorndike[t] thus speaks of the change made by Consecration, only denying it to be *such* a change as involves the abolition of the Elements.

"Upon these premises, I am content to go to issue as concerning the sense of the Catholic Church in this point. If it can any where be shewed, that the Church did ever pray that the Flesh and Blood might be substituted instead of the elements, under the accidents of them, then I am content, that this be counted henceforth the Sacramental presence of them in the Eucharist. But if the Church only pray that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements, in their bodily substance; because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His Flesh and Blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that I suppose is reason enough, to call it the Body and Blood of Christ Sacramentally, that is to say, as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It is not here to be denied, that all Ecclesias-

[t] Epilogue iii. 4. p. 30.

tical writers do, with one mouth, bear witness to the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Neither will any one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the consecration, or that to any faith, but that, upon which the Church professeth to proceed to the celebrating of it. And upon this account, when they speak of the elements, supposing the consecration to have passed upon them, they always call them by the name not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and Blood of Christ which they are become."

And, after having shewn this in detail, he thus sums up the evidence[w] of the Fathers, in contradistinction to the modern view which would make the only Presence of Christ in the believer's soul, and that as resulting, not from the consecrating words, but from the believer's faith.

"I will go no further in rehearsing the texts of the Fathers, which are to be found in all books of controversies concerning this, for the examination of them requires a volume on purpose. It shall be enough, that they all acknowledge the elements to be changed, translated, and turned into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood; though as in a Sacrament, that is, mystically: yet therefore by virtue of the consecration, not of his faith that receives."

He then establishes "on the other side[x] that this change is to be understood with that abatement, which the nature and substance of the elements requires, supposing it to remain the same as it was," shewing from the same authors[y], and from

[w] p. 31. [x] p. 32, 3. [y] p. 33, 4.

the Canon of the Mass, that they imply that "the heavenly grace hinders not, nor destroys the earthly nature," and thus concludes:

"And upon these premises, I conclude, that, as it is by no means to be denied that the elements are really changed, translated, turned, and converted into the Body and Blood of Christ; (so that whoso receiveth them with a living faith, is spiritually nourished by the same, he that with a dead faith, is guilty of crucifying Christ;) yet is not this change destructive of the bodily substance of the elements, but cumulative of them, with the spiritual grace of Christ's Body and Blood; so that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, turns to the nourishment of the body, whether the Body and Blood in the truth, turn to the nourishment and damnation of the soul."

Again, such writers as Bp. Cosins and the holy Bp. Ken, think it no contradiction to the words of our rubric that "the *natural* Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here," to affirm that "Christ's Flesh comes to us to be our food," that "Christ Who is in heaven, is also on the Altar," i. e. that He is there really, though not in a carnal manner.

Bp. Cosins[z].

"We confess with the Fathers, that the 'mode' is ineffable and unsearchable, that is, not to be enquired and searched into by reason, but to be believed by faith alone. For although it seems incredible, that in so great a distance of place, Christ's Flesh should come to us, to be

[z] Hist. Trans. c. 3. §. 3.

our food; yet we must remember, how much the power of the Holy Spirit is above our understanding, and how foolish it is to measure His immensity by our capacity. But what our understanding comprehends not, let faith conceive."

Bp. Ken[a].

"O God Incarnate, how Thou canst give us Thy Flesh to eat and Thy Blood to drink; how Thy Flesh is meat indeed; how Thou Who art in Heaven, art present on the Altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all, because Thou hast said it, and I firmly rely on Thy love and on Thy omnipotence, to make good Thy word, though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend."

Of course, great care and wisdom must be used by any in reclaiming a term, which, like that of the "real Presence," has acquired a sense very different from its original, lest they seem to be using it in a Romish, rather than in a Catholic, sense; and indeed, on this whole subject, great reverence is needed, that none take a sort of pleasure in reclaiming words, because the use of them is now unwonted; for myself, I have preferred keeping to the words of our formularies; they are so full of doctrine that one seems to need no more, and they come with authority; yet other turns of expression, such as are sanctioned by some of the great writers above quoted, that 'the Body and Blood of Christ are really present,' might often be adopted without offence, when the words 'real Presence'

[a] Exposition of Church Catechism, licensed 1685.

would, from long use, rather suggest to the mind the Romish *mode* of defining that Presence. But, whether any use the term or no in ordinary instruction, it is very important to vindicate it in the abstract, and shew that our Church in excepting against Transubstantiation, objects only to the scholastic mode of explaining the great doctrine which she holds,—a true, ' real Presence.'

It will be familiar to you, that scarcely any argument is now more common among Romanist controversialists than one founded on the wrong use of this term; they prove, at once, from Scripture, the doctrine of the " Real Presence," and then infer (as though involved in it) that of Transubstantiation[z], i. e. they affirm the truth, and then infer from it their own mode of defining that truth; and whereas our writers above quoted affirm that the question between us relates not to the Presence, but to the *mode* of the Presence, these, having proved the Sacred Presence, assume the only point at issue, the *mode* of the Presence. And this is, on their part, not unnatural, as having,

[z] Dr. Wiseman, Lectures 1836, Lect. 14—16, entitled on " Transubstantiation." In the Advertisement to vol. 2. it is said, " the tenth lecture was upon the Real Presence *or* Transubstantiation," as though they were altogether the same. So also Dr. Butler's " Truths of the Catholic Religion," Lect 1—5. Bellarmine treats the two doctrines (as they are) as distinct; the " Real Presence," de sacr. Euch. l. i. ii. Transubstantiation or " the *mode* of the existence of the Body of the Lord in the Eucharist." l. iii.

out of our Church, to do with those who deny any peculiar Presence of Christ in the Sacrament; yet, on the other hand, will it tend to draw away from our Church those of affectionate minds and childlike belief, who, seeking a real, substantial, union with their Redeemer,—to be, by the communication of His Body and Blood "verily and indeed" to their souls, knit in one to Him, "be one with Him and He with them,"—are, through inadequate statements of the reality of this holy Mystery, taught to seek in the Romish Communion, what is stored up for them in our own. Such minds enter not into any of the difficulties of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation; they acknowledge it, not in the sense of the Roman schools, but as implying the same real change which our own authors assert; they acquiesce in it as a name, but believe, under that name, that doctrine only, for whose sake they received it, the real true unfigurative Presence of their Redeeming Lord.

Article xxxi.

"The sacrifices (sacrificia) of Masses in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (perniciosæ imposturæ)."

In explanation of this Article, our friend con-

tends, that by the "sacrifices of masses" is not meant "the sacrifice of the Mass;" much less then the Primitive practice of commemorating the faithful departed at the Holy Eucharist, or the belief that they derived benefit thereby. He says,

> "Here the sacrifice of the Mass is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but the sacrifice of Masses, certain observances for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles saw before their eyes and knew to have been in force in time past, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching."

And this, one should think, was sufficiently clear, 1) from the language of the Article itself, for why should it be supposed that "the sacrifices of Masses" meant "the sacrifice in *the* Mass?" 2) from the language of writers of the time, who by "Masses" always mean "private Masses[a]." 3) They were the "private Masses" alone, which were said for the sake of gain, or were a source of

[a] e. g. In Sir T. More's, Supplication of souls, they say, "we have been eased and holpen and relieved both by the priests' prayers, of good virtuous people, and especially by the daily masses and other ghostly suffrages of priests, religious, and folk of Holy Church;" (quoted at length, Tract 81. p. 9.) add Cranmer, Defence of the Catholic Doctrine v. 16. (quoted ib. p. 11.) where he contrasts the "many masses every day," "the daily private masses," "the selling masses," with "the one common mass in a day," still existing in the Greek Church.

gain, which our Article condemns as "perniciosæ imposturæ." This he has sufficiently illustrated out of the Homilies, Bishop Bull, Burnet, and even the Council of Trent, or to add one passage only out of Bishop Jewel [b].

"Then ye began to tell the simple that it was sufficient for them to sit by; that your mass was a propitiatory sacrifice for their sins; that it was available unto them, ex opere operato, although they understood not what it meant: that you had power to apply it to quick and dead, and to whom ye listed; and that the very hearing thereof, of itself was meritorious. Upon this foundation ye erected up your Chanteries, your Monasteries, your pardons, your supererogations, and I know not what. Thus was the Holy Communion quite forgotten. Thus were your Masses multiplied above number. Thus ye came by that ye would have called your old gold."

The very point objected to by Bp. Jewel throughout this Article is "the plurality of masses;" the very form of Legacy was, that "masses" might be said for the soul of the departed, and these were private, special, masses (not the public service of the Mass) applied, as our Article says, to "quick and dead," or, as Bp. Jewel, "to whom ye listed." It was held in the Schools, that particular masses were more profitable to the souls in Purgatory than the mass. Bonaventura [c] says,

"Suffrages are to release from pain or guilt; but it is

[b] Answer to Harding, Art. 13. Plurality of Masses, Dis. 3.

[c] L. iv. ol. 45. art. 2. q. 3.

more to make satisfaction for the debt of many than of one, and satisfaction is made more easily for the debt of one than of many; therefore two need more suffrages than one; therefore, if they are divided between them, each has less; therefore, it does not seem that it extends equally to all."

It was also held, that whereas the "suffrages[d] of the Church in common benefitted most, cæteris paribus, those who most deserved to be benefitted, those offered specially, benefitted those most for whom they were performed;" and this they must hold, since, if their special masses did not most benefit those for whom they were offered, "the Church[d] which offered them did absurdly."

Of course, as far as the ordinary oblation of the mass was considered as relating to the same ends, the Romish doctrine would be condemned in it also; but there is this difference, that the erroneous doctrine was the sole foundation and groundwork of the particular masses, it was their whole substance; as Bonaventura says, they had no other object or ground, than the belief, that the masses said specially for departed souls, benefitted them, (in the words of the Article,) "to have remission of pain or guilt;" whereas, as no such end is expressed in the Canon of the Mass, so it is also an appendage only to its doctrine, engrafted in later times upon it. Thus, the special masses drew men's thoughts entirely to themselves; what was

[d] Ib.

supposed to be effected by the public sacrifice of the mass for the relief of souls in Purgatory was general only; no one could feel assured what share in the benefit his own friends had; it would be (in the doctrine of the Schools) "according to his deserts:" the special "masses," on the contrary, afforded a definite relief; they had no other end in view than that of applying to the relief of the individuals the infinite merits of Christ; they concentrated the benefits of the Meritorious Sacrifice of the Cross, which they were thought to renew, upon the "remission of pain and guilt" of a single soul. I cannot then but think that the writers of the Article had, as our friend says, the "private, special, masses" mainly in view, although including the "public mass" as far as in doctrine it agreed with them.

And this doctrine it is important for people to view distinctly, lest, taking the words in a vague way, they should involve Catholic truth in the Romish error against which our Article is directed. In this Article, then, the popular Romish doctrine is described as a whole, that in "the sacrifices of masses" as "was commonly said," "the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt." This is condemned as a whole, and it is obviously no legitimate interpretation to omit a portion of this doctrine, and infer that the writers of the Article would have condemned the rest without it. The errors it pre-

supposes are the Romish doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory, which are condemned elsewhere separately, to which it here adds the "common" statement of the doctrine of the "sacrifices of masses," which readily follows upon Transubstantiation, the "repetition of the sacrifice of Christ." It presupposes that the departed for whom it was offered, were held to be in a state of "pain and guilt," to obtain remission of them by that offering, and that, not an oblation or sacrifice commemorative of the One Sacrifice, and thereby acceptable to God, but of Christ Himself. "Then if the Priest do offer the Sacrament, he doth offer indeed Christ Himself[b]." Any doctrine which does not involve these statements is not the doctrine condemned by the Articles. This Bishop Ridley himself might alone shew, for he states his objection to the Romish doctrine of the Sacrifice to be founded on the error of Transubstantiation. "Transubstantiation is the very foundation, whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand;" and "*This kind* of oblation [the Romish] standeth upon Transubstantiation his cousin-german, and they do both grow upon the same ground." And the celebrated dictum of Bishop Andrewes[c], which has passed almost into a proverbial statement of the principles of our

[b] Respons. ad Card. Bell. c. 8.

[c] Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper, p. 6. 17. 16. quoted more at length, Tract 81. p. 10.

Church, is but a following out of this of Bishop Ridley, "Do ye take away from the mass your Transubstantiation, and we shall not long have any question about the Sacrifice." Bp. Jewel also in like words[c], states this to be the only point at issue. "S. Cyprian saith, 'we offer our Lord's cup mixed with wine.' But he saith not as you say, 'we offer up *the Son of God substantially and really* unto the Father.' Take away *only this blasphemy* wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup, and of the Sacrifice whilst ye list." They are not the words then, "offer Christ," which are in themselves condemned, but the doctrine of a real sacrifice of Christ Himself, distinct from the sacrifice of the Cross; the words may be found in Christian Antiquity, but not in this meaning, whereas in those later times it certainly was again and again stated, that there was in the Holy Eucharist not only a sacramental oblation of His sacrifice, pleading Its merits, and so obtaining mercy from God, but "a real and true sacrifice of the Son of God[d]," by virtue of Transubstantiation; "a sacrifice," in the words of a recent apologist[e], "truly real, because Jesus Christ is really therein

[c] Defence of Apology, p. 2. c. 5. v. fin. p. 140.

[d] See Courayer's comment on Bishop Jewel's objections to Harding's statements of the doctrine, Defense de la Diss. sur la validité des Ordin. Angl. iv. 6. quoted Tract 81, p. 44—46.

[e] Dr. Butler, lect. 8. p. 228.

contained, and really in it, under the symbols of His Passion, offered up to His Eternal Father:" and it is used as an argument[f] of the infinite value of that Sacrifice, that "the thing offered is of infinite dignity, inasmuch as *whole* Christ is offered." It is the corporeal offering of the Son of God which alone is objected to. Again, the words "to have remission of pain and guilt" restrain the condemnation in the Article to the application of Masses to souls in Purgatory; "the Sacrifice[g] benefits also very much the faithful departed who are being purged in Purgatory, to the mitigation and payment of punishments. This is to be held as matter of faith, as is clear from the Council of Trent, cap. 22. can. 3."

It is only questioned in the Roman schools whether it confers this benefit by the very act of offering (ex opere operato) or by way of impetration;

"It benefits[h] in both ways, some deny that it doth by the mere act of offering, as Melch. Canus, Dom. Soto, for they say that this sacrifice has not an infallible effect, but 'if God so will.' Whence it appears, that it does not benefit ex opere operato, since the fruit of this is altogether infallible in one capable of it, who does not place any bar; but the contrary is more probable, as held by Ricardus, art. 6. P. Soto. Lect. 7. de Euch. D. Thom. P. iv. D. 45. q. 2. n. 3. ad 3." "It

[f] Less. de Purg. art. i. dub. 10.

[g] Less. ib. dub. 9.

[h] Ib.

confers[i] benefit ex opere operato, which mode all Doctors and the more recent who write against heresies admit." "It confers[k] ex opere operato remission of temporal punishment."

The very words "pain or guilt" (pœnæ vel culpæ) which the Article uses, are those employed by the Schoolmen, who lay down, that "the punishment of Purgatory can cleanse us from the guilt (culpa) of venial, and from the punishment (pœna) of mortal sin[l]." And this it is which even Cranmer objects to, the "propitiatory sacrifice of the priests in their masses, whereby they may remit sin and redeem souls out of purgatory[m]."

Such then being the limitations which the Article itself furnishes,—that the doctrine which it condemns is one which implies Transubstantiation, a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the deliverance of souls from pain and guilt in Purgatory, it follows that no other doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is contemplated by it. That solemn doctrine has been maintained by the chief Divines and Bishops of our Church ever since the Reformation as before it, only separate from the errors

[i] Ib. dub. 7.

[k] Ib. dub. 8.

[l] See Bonav. L. iv. dist. 21. q. 2. p. 1. art. 2. who quotes also Alex. Alen. 4. p. q. 13. memb. 3. art. 3. §. 5. Richard. 4. Sent. d. 21. art. 2. q. 1. Steph. Brulef. 4. Sent. d. 21. q. 3. Pet. de Tarent. ib. q. 1.

[m] Answer to Gardiner, b. v. f. 3. p. 544. see Tract 81, p. 48, 49.

formerly blended with it; the language in which they have expressed it, has varied, as they have feared that the one or the other expression might countenance errors held in the Church of Rome; but it is clear, from the first, that what Cranmer and Ridley meant to object to were the Romish errors, not the truth; and as our position became more defined, and there was less apprehension that such errors should find place among our people, that truth came to be more definitely and systematically enounced. Both these points have been recently treated of, and the statements of our Divines given at such length[n], that it is not necessary here to speak further on the subject. I will therefore only select two specimens, one shewing that the very words "propitiatory[o] and impetratory," as applied to the Eucharistic Sacrifice in a sound

[n] Tract 81, "Testimony of writers of the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," and its Preface.

[o] "Propitiatory" is, as Thorndike explains it, that which "doth render God propitious;" it is thus used by a modern Romanist also, "we say, the Mass" [the Holy Eucharist] "is a propitiatory sacrifice, that is to say, a sacrifice that renders God propitiatory to men." Dr. Butler's Lect. 8. p. 226. Bp. Overall adopts the word as occurring in the fathers, Tract 81, p. 73. and others also. In the same sense, Nelson prays "that I may so importunately plead the merit of it" [the full perfect oblation on the Cross] "in this commemoration of that Sacrifice, as to *render* Thee gracious and *propitious* to me, a miserable sinner." ib. p. 303. Those who with Bp. Jewel (ib. p. 61.) and Bp. Hall, (ib. p. 107.) take "propitiatory" in the sense of "being" or "making a propitiation," must reject it.

sense, are not objected to by approved Divines in our Church; the other as a distinct and clear enunciation of the doctrine from one of her present Bishops.

The first are words of the learned Thorndike [p].

"After the consecration is past, having shewed you, that St. Paul hath appointed, that, at the celebration of the Eucharist, prayers, supplications, and intercessions be made for all estates of the world and of the Church; and that the Jews have no right to the Eucharist, (according to the Epistle to the Hebrews,) because, though Eucharistical, yet it is of that kind, the Blood whereof is offered to God within the veil, with prayers for all estates of the world, as Philo and Josephus inform us; seeing the Apostle hath so plainly expounded us the accomplishment of that figure, in the offering of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross to the Father in the highest heavens, to obtain the benefits of His Passion for us; and that the Eucharist is nothing else but the representation here upon earth, of what is done there; these things, I say, considered, necessarily it follows, that whoso believes, the prayers of the Church, made in our Lord's Name, do render God propitious to them for whom they are made, and obtain for them the benefits of Christ's Death, (which he that believes not is no Christian,) cannot question that those which are made by St. Paul's appointment, at the celebration of the Eucharist, offering up unto God the merits and sufferings of Christ there represented, must be peculiarly and especially effectual to the same purposes. And that the Eucharist may very properly be accounted a sacrifice propitiatory and impetratory both, in this regard; because the offering of it up to God, with and by the same prayers, doth render God propitious, and obtain

[p] Epilogue iii. 5. p. 42. quoted Tract 81, p. 169.

at His hands the benefits of Christ's Death which it representeth; there can be no cause to refuse, being no more than the simplicity of plain Christianity enforceth."

I add the other statement the rather, as being so concise and yet so full an exposition of the doctrine, withdrawing nothing of the truth, and yet so conveying it, that none can think that it goes beyond it.

"Not[p] only is the entrance into the Church by a visible sign, but that body is visible also in the appointed means of sustaining the new life, especially in that most sacred and sublime mystery of our religion, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the commemorative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ; in which the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to God on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven; the Church on earth doing, after its manner, the same thing as its Head in heaven; Christ in heaven presenting the Sacrifice and applying it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God (with thanksgiving) in the virtue and merit of that Sacrifice which it thus exhibits."

Article xxii.

"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons (de indulgentiis), worshipping (de veneratione) and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing (res est futilis) vainly (inaniter) invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant (contradicit) to the word of God."

[p] Charge of the Bishop of Exeter, 1836, p. 43, 44.

In speaking of this Article, it is necessary to bear in mind, as our friend has said, that the question is, not what is allowable to be taught, not what it is expedient to practise, but what private opinions a person may or may not hold, consistently with the tenor of the Articles. We received our commission to teach in this our Church, wherein we were made members of Christ, through her Bishops; as then we have ample scope for teaching, in what she holds and delivers out of or agreeable to Holy Scripture, so we have no commission to teach opinions, which she practically excludes. Even as to practices, which *are* Catholic[q], as prayers for departed saints, a Minister of our Church would, I think, do wrong to inculcate in his sermons, any thing for which his Church gives no countenance. Much more as to points, which, not being Catholic, have no authority from the Church, as the interpreter of Holy Scripture, any more than from the direct teaching of Scripture itself. Still more, again, as to any such points, which, not being Catholic, have also once degenerated into dangerous errors; their introduction would too pro-

[q] By "Catholic *practices*," I mean such as were universally received in the Church; "the Catholic *Faith*" is that Faith which the Church taught universally out of the Holy Scripture, and which is embodied in the Creeds. The Catholic Faith is necessary to salvation, and nothing of it may be parted with; Catholic practice may be laid aside, (as in this case by our Church,) if there be any constraining cause; though, of course, with reverence and circumspection.

bably favour the bringing back of those errors, which were once derived from them, and which yet exist. The likelihood of *any* purgatorial process after this life cannot be safely taught even by any who holds it, while the Romish doctrine of purgatory still exists; apostrophes to saints to pray for us, if they hear us, which—detached as they were from regular devotion and sparingly as they occurred—we find without apprehension of injury in the mouths of holy men at the close of the fourth century, would countenance idolatry in this. It would be trifling with the deposit of a pure faith which God has committed to our keeping, and tampering with the souls of our people whom we might be leading into sin, were any one to teach such points as these. Much more strongly may one say, should any in this place abstain from inculcating upon the minds of the young, what, as being young, they might probably exaggerate, and give an undue prominence to in their own minds. But of this, I may safely say, there has been no instance, nor is there any tendency to it. People in this place are far too much impressed with their own responsibility, and feel too deeply how much is at issue at this great crisis, to lead the minds entrusted to them off to any such questions as these, so far removed, in any case, from the centre of Christian life and doctrine. But even apart from consequences, our office, as we have often repeated, is within our Church; to develope, bring out, incul-

cate her teaching, not add to her of our own minds what we have not received.

But, assuming this, the question which our friend had in view was, as I said, not what a Minister might do, but what is the meaning of the Article. And, here, it seems to me equally plain, and it is almost a truism to state, that since the Article definitely speaks of the "Romish doctrine" on these points, it does not mean to condemn any other. What opinion any of the framers of the Articles may have had as to any doctrine on these points, *not Romish*, or whether they had formed to themselves any definite view, is altogether beside the question; they were not drawing up a system of faith, which should comprehend the whole compass of the subject on which they spoke, but setting definite marks against certain corruptions existing and maintained in their own times, and before their eyes; they were practically providing against a certain existing practical evil; they were not concerned to trace the origin of existing corruptions, but to warn against them as they existed; every thing else lay beyond their horizon, and they were not contemplating it; it was not their concern, whether such or such a doctrine, approximating in whatever degree to the Romish, were found here and there in the early Church; rather, with their practical veneration for the first ages of the Gospel, the writers of those times, when they do touch upon any such points, point out

the difference sooner than the resemblance, rather shew that what is found in primitive Antiquity is not Romish, than seek to identify it with the form, into which, (if it were so,) it, in later ages, passed.

The very wording of the Article "Romish doctrine," or, as it before stood, "doctrine of the Schoolmen," shews what was in the mind of the writers; had they meant to condemn every doctrine of "purgatory" or "invocation of saints," they would obviously not have restrained their censure by the insertion of the word "Romish." No one could seriously contend, that while they spoke against the "Romish" doctrine of purgatory, they meant to include any views held by the "Greeks," or the belief in any purgatorial process, distinct from the Romish, whether supposed to take place at the entrance of Paradise or at the Day of Judgment. So to interpret the articles would manifestly be a mere inference, founded on the supposed opinions of the writers, which, since they did not choose to express, we have no right to intrude upon their words. It were an arbitrary stretch of their meaning, opening the way to any other comments. And yet it would probably be found that the popular system of interpretation, which our friend opposed, did this; and not only in points, in which no direct evil consequences would result, but where true doctrine would be affected.

I am not herein speaking of any thing in this

place, where a tone of more accurate thought prevails, (as neither was our friend's Tract written for persons here,) but of the vague way in which the doctrines censured in this Article are popularly misunderstood, and the injury to sound doctrine or to habits of mind thence ensuing. Thus, one cannot but know, that together with the "Romish doctrine of pardons," persons are taught to shrink from the whole subject of primitive discipline, as something interfering between the soul and its Redeemer, instead of being beneficial to it; that they would regard the recommendation of confession,—not as an essential to absolution, but as expedient and healthful, yet with the view not merely of "obtaining ghostly advice and comfort," but of taking shame before men,—as something Popish; or again they would at once condemn all thought of penance and self-chastisement for specific sins, as connected with the Romish doctrine of "satisfaction;" or they look with suspicion on any statement, that the Absolution solemnly pronounced in Christ's Name, "by His authority committed unto us," is not merely a comfortable "declaration" of His mercies, but may alter the state of the soul in God's sight; that it is not merely a relaxation of "ecclesiastical censures," which we have not, but may tend to "loose the bands of those sins, which by our frailty we have committed," and remove the obstructions which sin presents to the shining in of the grace of Christ upon the soul. There is, as you are

aware, a large negative theory on these subjects afloat, too little informed, to know what it apprehends, and so apprehending every thing; morbidly sensitive of any thing which it thinks may unduly exalt the Priestly office, but careless as to securing our individual humility and self-discipline; condemning under names whose real meaning people know not, doctrines and holy practices, whose efficacy they have never tried; anxious to secure our irresponsibility to man, our freedom from external control, the non-interference of man between the soul and its Maker, but not anxious how to secure our sense of responsibility to God, our exemption from lawlessness, our attainment of all those blessings, which God intended for us, as ministered through man; jealous against superstition, not against irreverence. Thus, together with the "Romish doctrine of pardons," the whole subject of Absolution is often discarded; with Purgatory, the intermediate state; with invocation of Saints, the feeling of communion with them in the one Church, of which they are the perfected members; with the veneration of relics, the feeling that "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints," and the belief in the miracles, which, in some cases at least in the early Church, He certainly wrought through them; thus admitting in fact the very principles of infidelity, and rejecting on à priori notions what were after all the "mighty works" of God's hand; or together with the un-Ca-

tholic veneration of images, people reject as superstitious all outward reverence for holy things and places; they regard the Altar, whence the holy Mysteries of our Redemption are distributed, as no ways distinguished above the rest of God's House, nor that House itself as sanctified by the presence of Angels and the unseen coming of our Lord. The mere Protestant walks up and down with his hat on, "on holy ground," listening to the solemn tones of the organ at Haarlem.

It is then, practically also, of moment to distinguish what our Article does condemn as Romish, lest we involve under it feelings, and doctrines, and practices, which are primitive. It is of moment to us practically, since it cannot be concealed that many are deterred from practices, which, though not essential, might still be a great safe-guard to them, and are countenanced or (under certain circumstances) recommended by our Church, by the fear of approximating to something corrupt in the Romish system. Thus, one cannot doubt, that the more frequent use of Confession to God's Ministers, (which our Church recommends in certain cases as a preparation for the Holy Communion or for death,) would be a great relief to persons' consciences, a great protection against the corruptions which gradually steal over and steal away the young, a great promoter of conscientiousness. One cannot doubt again, that the restoration "fourfold" of what has been wrongly gotten,

or liberal distribution to the poor, in token of sorrow for sin and love to Him Who we trust will remit it, (which our Church recommends by the example of Zacchæus,) or the acts of humiliation of which she speaks with regret in her service for Ash-Wednesday, would be very healthful to persons' souls, and not any way approximate to the abuses of the Romish Confessional or their system of penances. And for our Church generally, it is notorious that this indiscriminate condemnation of what may be a means of holiness, together with what is unholy in the practical system of Rome, is one of the most dangerous allurements to persons to seek in the Romish Communion, what they might have found, without its corruptions, in our own.

But, beyond this, it is of course right, without any view to consequences at all, to adhere to the truth; and so not to extend any condemnation in our Articles to points not contemplated in them, even though unauthorized, or, as the result may have shewn, dangerous. We may not forfeit truth for expediency; if then our Articles be not so rigid, as some on a cursory view might imagine, and so do not exclude things unadvisable, which some might wish had been peremptorily excluded, we must not seek protection against their introduction by extending the meaning of our Articles, but in some other way, and trust in God's good Providence for our safety, not look for it by maintaining

an interpretation which, though convenient, is untrue. It does not follow, then, that because any may maintain a certain doctrine or practice not to be condemned by our Articles, he therefore thinks that it would not be very inexpedient or, under the circumstances, unlawful; the use of the "ora pro nobis" (of which I shall have to speak presently) would probably in almost, if not all, cases, be so; still, if the terms of our Articles do not pronounce upon it, we must be content to think that it is best thus, and seek for a remedy against any contingent risk in some other way.

To enter then a little into the details, which our friend, (as he has since stated,) omitted in the first instance to consider, lest he should seem to imply any definite practices to be allowable, which he only shewed our Articles not to disallow, the framers not seeing any necessity to pronounce upon them.

1. *Romish Doctrine of Purgatory.*

The chief characteristics of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, seem to me, that it is 1) a *state* of suffering, 2) of punishment.

Thus to take the statement of two authors living among us, one[p] says,

"Catholics hold there is a Purgatory, that is to say, a place or state where souls departing this life with remission of their sins, as to the guilt or eternal pain, but yet liable to some temporal punishment (of which I have just

[p] Dr. Butler, lect. 6. on Purgatory.

spoken) still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects, which we call venial sins, are purged before their admittance into Heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter."

Dr. Wiseman[q],

"From this subject of satisfaction, I naturally proceed to the consideration of another topic, intimately connected with it, the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. The Catholic doctrine of satisfaction would be incomplete without it. The idea that God requires satisfaction, and will punish sin, would not go to its furthest and necessary consequence, if we did not believe that the sinner may be so punished in another world, as not to be wholly and eternally cast away from God."

In like way Bellarmine[r] says, the "true Catholic opinion" is that "Purgatory is only for those who die with venial faults, (1 Cor. iii.)—and again, for those who depart this life with punishment due (cum reatu pœnæ) their faults being already remitted."

These two statements seem to me its leading peculiarities; and, taken together, at once distinguish it from any thing found in the early Church. If any of the Fathers definitely hold that there will be suffering after this life, for some who shall be saved, it is not an abiding *state* of suffering; and again it is spoken of, solely with respect to the future, the purifying for the Presence of the All-holy God, not as a

[q] Lect. II. on Satisfaction and Purgatory, p. 52.

[r] De Purg. ii. 1.

"satisfaction" for past sin, which "God requires." These two combined points, then, sufficiently distinguish the Romish doctrine: add to this, that the three Fathers of the African Church, who may be thought most to approximate to the Romish doctrine, speak doubtingly; in the Romish Church it is an article of Faith, so that Cardinal Bellarmine says[s], that "whoso believeth not Purgatory, shall never arrive thither, but be tormented with everlasting burning in Hell."

It is, I should add, to me very questionable, whether these very Fathers do hold a doctrine bearing upon that of Rome: Tertullian[t] is speaking of sufferings of the soul without the body before the Day of Judgment, but has no hint that they who so suffer, will then be saved; rather he implies that a portion of the sufferings is paid then, without forestalling the full suffering, which is to follow, of "soul and body in hell;" and so the text (Matt. v. 25. Luke xii. 58.) is understood by S. Augustine in the same Church and by most fathers[u], of being "cast into a prison" from which

[r] iv. dist. 21. quoted also by Bonaventura, &c.

[s] De Purg. i. 11.

[t] "In short, seeing we understand that prison, which the Gospel points to, to be the 'place below' (inferos), and explain the last farthing, of every slight sin for which, in the interval before the resurrection, punishment is to be paid (luendum), no one will doubt that the soul pays somewhat in the place below, without forestalling the fulness of the resurrection through the flesh also." de anim. fin.

[u] S. Ambrose in Luc. S. Hil. in Matt. S. Aug. de Serm.

they should never come forth; as indeed who of men could "pay the very last farthing" due to God? (comp. Matt. xviii. 25, 34.) Again, even Romanist Theologians have thought that S. Cyprian[x] is speaking of sufferings in this life, and this, from the context, appears to me most probable. S. Augustine has distinct and opposite conjectures, evincing that he had not a definite *opinion* upon this subject; and even when[y], in opposing those who thought that all sins, however grievous, of baptized Christians who remained in the unity of the Church, would be remitted through temporal fire, he admits it to be a question, whether there be not such a fire, whereby lighter sins would be cleansed, the whole context leads one to think that he is speaking of privation of bliss and mental pain not of corporeal suffering. For he had, before, been speaking of the pains which they endured through temporal *losses*, who, holding

Dom. in Monte, l. i. §. 30. Theoph. ad Luc. S. Jerome in Matt. implies the same. Stapleton Antid. Ev. says, that few Catholics interpret it of Purgatory.

[x] "It is one thing to stand for pardon, another to arrive safe at glory; one to be sent to prison, there to remain till the last farthing be paid; another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to be tormented for sin in long pain and so to be cleansed, and to be purged a long while in the fire, another to have washed away all sin in martyrdom; one thing, in short, to wait for the Lord's sentence in the day of judgment, another at once to be crowned by Him." Ep. 55. ad Antonian.

[y] Lib. ad Dulcit. q. i. §. 6—13. see the context more fully, Tract 79. p. 41. where his other conjectures are also given.

"the foundation," "built thereon wood, hay, stubble," i. e. temporal enjoyments, which yet they did not prefer to the "foundation," Christ; and that "through this pain of having to forego them they were saved as by fire." When then he goes on to say,

"Something of this sort, *it is not incredible*, may take place after this life also, and whether it be so, may be enquired, (whether it can be discovered or no;) that some believers, through a certain purgatorial fire, as they have more or less loved perishing goods, shall more slowly or speedily attain salvation;"

it seems to me certain, that he had in view a "pœna damni" only, corresponding to the sufferings from privation in this life of which he had just spoken; as his very words too, "shall more slowly or speedily attain salvation," seem to indicate what that privation was, viz. of the bliss of the Beatific Vision, such as, in the intermediate state, is vouchsafed to the saved.

To return, however, to the "Romish Doctrine." The points, which I have selected as characteristic of it, would,—nakedly as I have stated them,—give a very inadequate notion of the doctrine of Purgatory, as it was taught at the time of our Reformation. To fill up this outline, we must go back to the "doctrine of the Schoolmen[r]," to which our Articles originally referred.

[r] It seems strange that Dr. Wiseman, in his Letter to Mr. Newman, should not have known what Mr. N. meant by a

P. Lombard then changes into certainty the conjecture[s] of S. Augustine; and then he applies to the Roman *state* of suffering, words in which S. Augustine is speaking, according to the Greek view, of a fire at the Day of Judgment[t]. However, on the supposed authority of S. Augustine, it became a received maxim in the Schools, that the "fire" of purgatory "is more grievous than any thing that a man can suffer in this

term used commonly among Romanist writers also, the "doctrine of the Schools," namely, the Schoolmen, whose sayings formed "the received doctrine of the day." Dr. Wiseman's answer, appealing to what himself and other Divines *now* teach, is wholly beside the mark; the whole Letter consequently but leads away from the point at issue. One does not like to say what seems personal, but who will guarantee that Dr. Wiseman's teaching was accounted sound, or sufficiently "Roman?" Report certainly said otherwise, and spoke of doubts and misgivings felt in the highest quarters.

[s] In Ps. 37. §. 3. S. Aug. here as elsewhere, begins by owning that what he is going to say is but conjecture, "Et forte," "And perhaps."

[t] See Tract 79, p. 40. Bp. Montague (Answer to the late Gagger of Protestants, p. 288, 9.) points out the differences between S. Aug.'s view and the Roman; 1) S. Aug. calls it an "amending fire," (emendatorius). Romanists hold Purgatory to be penal only. 2) He places it at the Day of Judgment, when the Romish purgatory ceases. 3) Bp. M. quotes the "ordinary Gloss" as understanding S. Aug. of the Day of Judgment. It may be added that S. Aug. expresses the Greek view, in a passage corresponding to this, in the same work on the Psalms, (in Ps. vi. §. 3.) as also in another, (in Ps. 103. Serm. 3. §. 5. see Tract 79, p. 40, 41.) whereas in this work he no where even conjectures that the Purgatorial fire will be lasting.

life;" Aquinas[x], from Gregory the Great, affirms, that "the fire of purgatory and hell are the same," and also, from himself, as the only difference, "that the[y] damned, as being lower in merit, are to be ranked lower in place;" that "the[z] punishment is two-fold, one, of the loss of the Divine Vision (pœna damni), the other of suffering (pœna sensus), in that they will be punished with corporeal fire, and in either, the least punishment of purgatory is greater than the greatest of this life." Bonaventura says, "the doctors of our time commonly hold[a]," (as he does himself,) "that the purgatorial fire is corporeal or material," and "though S. Augustine seemed to doubt herein, other doctors remove all doubt from us," and he argues, at length, against the notion of a spiritual purgatory.

In any case, the pains were held to differ only in

[x] ib. ii. 3. Præt.

[y] ib. v. ad 2.

[z] ib. i. ad 3.

[a] This is affirmed also by Alex. Alens. iv. P. q. 15. art. 2. §. 2. Agazel. lib. phys. v. 4. ap. Rich. de Med. Vill. "since the fire which afflicteth souls in purgatory is more active than our fire, which yet is most afflictive of all elements," add Rich. himself iv. dist. 20. art. 2. q. 1. In Bonav. there are further quoted, Brulefer ib. q. 4. and Pet. de Tarantas. (afterwards Pope Innocent V.) ib. q. 3. Thom. Arg. ib. q. 1. art. 3. Less (in Thom. de Purg. c. i. dub. 2.) says, "It is *certain* that in Purgatory there is punishment of suffering [not of privation only]; that the punishment is by material fire is the common opinion of the Doctors, yet not matter of Faith."

duration from those of hell, (with regard to which the same question was raised whether the fire was material,) and hence it was argued that the fire was the same.

"Because[b] those souls suffer the same punishment as the damned, namely, the punishment of privation [of God's Presence] and suffering, and this differs only in that it is not eternal, as is the punishment of the damned, therefore it agreeth hereto, that they should suffer in the same place and by the same fire."

Bonaventura says further that souls remain there longer or shorter, as they remained longer or shorter in sin[c], and that

"The manifold authority of the saints establishes, that some, namely venial, sins may be remitted not in this world only, but also in purgatory, and since there is no room there for deserts or for sacraments, such punitive or purgatorial fire is called in aid, so called because the soul is purged from the dross of sin, and from venial faults, if it depart with them[d]."

Further, this state was considered capable of alle-

[b] Less. l. c.

[c] So also Alex. Alen. l. c. q. 3. In Bonaventura there are also quoted Richard. l. c. q. 2. Brulef. l. c. q. 5.

[d] "'Final grace effaces venial sin in the act of the dissolution of soul and body,' &c. This was said by those of old, but now *it is commonly held* that venial sin, being taken hence by many, is purged in purgatory as to the guilt also." Albert. M. comp. Theol. verit. iii. 13. quoted by Abp. Ussher, "of purgatory:" add also Alex. Alens. l. 3. memb. 3. art. 3. §. 5. In Bonav. are also quoted Rich. l. c. q. 1. Brulef. l. c. q. 3. Pet. de Tarantas. l. c. q. 1.

viation through indulgences; of which more presently. It is stated also as a probable opinion[e], that individuals remained in purgatory during centuries. Yet more, in order fully to realize what the writers of our Articles had in view, in condemning the "Roman doctrine" of purgatory, we ought to take into account the popular tales and representations circulated at that time, the pictures in which it was exhibited, the vivid descriptions given of it, the detailed visions in which it was said to have been revealed; the lengthened period of thousands of years, during which it must be supposed to last, since the indulgences remitted thousands of years of suffering. And on this ground alone, it must practically have effaced the thought of Hell in the minds of the people, since so long temporal punishment will in itself fill the mind, and leave no room for the thought of any thing beyond it.

The above abstract statements, however, though they give no idea of the *practical* character of the doctrine, suffice to explain what the Article means by the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory;" according to which it was "a lengthened *state* of actual suffering, as well as of privation of the Divine Vision, without rest day or night[f], through real fire, and

[e] Less ad S. Thomam de Purg. c. 2. dub. 4. "pains, which else [i. e. unless daily masses were purchased], will hold them here with us in fire and torments intolerable, only God knoweth how long." Sir Thos. More, Supplication of Souls, Works, p. 316.

[f] "We—not yet importunately bereave you of your rest, with

that the fire of Hell, not only purifying the soul for the Divine Presence, but also satisfying the Divine Justice, exacting the punishment of sin, which, at departure from this life, remained unpaid, yet capable of mitigation through the treasure of merits at the disposal of the Pope."

Such then being the "Roman doctrine," it follows, of course, that a doctrine differing in kind from this, is not the doctrine contemplated, one way or other, in the Articles. The supposition of a pœna damni, that those who were not "pure in heart" might not for a long period be admitted to "see God," and that this privation might itself be purifying; that the whole period between the departure from the body and the Resurrection may be one of painless purifying of the soul, in order that it may be capable (in S. Irenæus' words) to "receive God;" that persons may, by some sorts of sin, forfeit the fulness of the Presence of Christ in the intermediate state; that, though with a cheering hope, they may not be certain of their salvation, any more than in this life they are; and that under any of these circumstances, it may please God to give to such souls a larger portion of comfort and joy, through the prayers and oblations of the Church,—any of these suppositions are quite distinct from the Roman doctrine, which maintains "a temporary period of actual *suffering*."

crying at your ears, at unseasonable times, when ye would (*which we do never*) repose yourselves and take ease." Sir Thos. More, l. c. p. 288. See, at length, Tract 81, p. 9.

On the other hand, the view found in Origen, S. Ambrose, S. Hilary, S. Jerome, S. Paulinus of Nola, S. Basil, and S. Gregory of Nazianzum, that "for[g] all but the highest saints in whom love dissolved all remaining dross whatsoever, some transient suffering, more or less in duration, was in store at the Day of Judgment," though it has the notion of "suffering," differs from the Romish, as to the time when it takes place, and that it is not a *state* of suffering; nor again does it stand in any relation to the prayers of the Church. This view is accordingly condemned by Romanist writers as inadequate or erroneous[h], who thus again confirm the view, (if any such confirmation were needed,) that such is not the doctrine condemned by our Articles as the "Roman doctrine."

Our Article does not then condemn all notion of a purifying process after this life, but one distinct system; and our Church has evidently taken the more humble line, not presuming to affirm or deny what has not been revealed, but denying the only view of Purgatory contrary to Holy Scripture, which for our consolation declares our departed to be at "rest," whereas this exhibits them in intense suffering. If any collect from the impression of Antiquity, a general awe of what may pass between death and Judgment, it may be that he will acquire more reverent thoughts of the exceed-

[g] Tract 79 on Purgatory, p. 35.

[h] Bellarm. de Purg. ii. 1. quoted Tract 79, p. 26.

ing holiness of God's Presence, and reflect more earnestly as to the fruits of actions or courses of action, and learn to speak less peremptorily, one way or the other, when Holy Scripture is silent; but our Article leaves him free, so long as he maintain not that one doctrine which is "repugnant to the word of God."

In conclusion, since people are disposed to believe all things, which are said hardly of what they dislike, I may just observe, that neither in my own writings, nor in those of any of my friends, is there any trace of a tenet, which it has lately been affirmed[g] that we are "zealous in teaching," "that there is a Purgatory for the purification of the saints," nor do I hold it. Our friend, as you know, has put it prominently forward as one of the chief points of our controversy with Rome[h].

2. *Romish Doctrine of Pardons.*

Our Article joins on the "Romish doctrine of Pardons" or "Indulgences" [indulgentiis] immediately to that of "Purgatory," thereby the more shewing what it was which it meant to condemn, the assumed power, namely, of the Pope to lessen by Indulgences the period of Purgatorial suffering.

[g] Edinburgh Review, No. 147. p. 272.

[h] Tract 79, and Lectures on Romanism.

This is illustrated by the citations of Bp. Jewel[i], shewing that "Pardons sprung out of Purgatory."

"Roffensis saith (contr. Lutherum. Polydor. de Inventor. l. 8. c. 1.) 'Thus Jansene: It cannot well appear from whom Pardons first began. Among the old Doctors and Fathers of the Church, there was either no talk at all, or very little talk of Purgatory. But as long as Purgatory was not cared for, there was no man that sought for Pardons. For the whole price of Pardons hangeth of Purgatory. Take away Purgatory, and what shall we need of Pardons? Pardons began, when folk were a little feared with the pains of Purgatory."

"Johannes Major saith (in 4. Sent. Dist. 20. Quæst. 2.): 'Of Pardons little may be said of certainty: for the Scripture expressly saith nothing of them. Touching that Christ saith unto Peter, Unto thee will I give the keys, &c. we must understand this authority with a corn of salt,' (otherwise it may be unsavory.) 'Therefore certain' of the Pope's 'Pardons that promise twenty thousand years are foolish and superstitious[k].'

[i] Defence of Apol. c. 7. dis. 1. p. 486.

[k] The authenticity of these pardons has been disputed in modern times; Bouvier, however, defends the principle on which they rest; "it may happen that such indulgences would not be equal to a Plenary Indulgence. For let us suppose a sinner who [sin which] merited 10 years of Canonical penance; let us also suppose a man who lived 20 or 30 years in the habit of frequently committing sin by thought, by desire, and by action, which is not uncommon; in the language of the Prophet, he will have multiplied his sins beyond the hairs of his head; each in particular will not merit less punishment than if it had been committed only once; how great therefore would be the time of Canonical penance which this sinner should perform in order to comply with the Church discipline? It is incalculable; and even, in this case, it is probable it would be far from satisfying

" Your School Doctors themselves (Veselus) are wont sometime to say, ' The devising of Pardons is a godly guile, and a hurtless deceit; to the intent that by a devout kind of error the people may be drawne to godliness.'

" Here Mr. Harding, you see the Antiquitie, Authoritie, and best countenance of your Pardons: that they flowed first out of the sinks of your Purgatory, as one vanity floweth out of another: you see that your Pardons sometimes may be ' superstitious,' and full of ' folly:' you see that the sale of your Pardons is ' a godly guile,' and a devout kinde of error to lead the people."—

" Alphonsus de Castro saith (Lib. 8. Indulgentiæ): ' There is nothing that the Scriptures have less opened, or whereof the old learned Fathers have less written, than of Pardons. Of Pardons (in the Scriptures and Doctors) there is no mention.' "

God's justice, since we are ignorant of the proportion between the Canonical penance, and the diminution of the pains of the next life. However, we hold that a Plenary Indulgence, perfectly gained, would cancel this immense debt in all its extent! Therefore we ought not to condemn Partial Indulgences for being too long, provided they are well authenticated; otherwise we should condemn Plenary Indulgences [1]." In fact, also, the manifold Indulgences given to the members of religious fraternities in the Romish Church would soon make up this sum. Thus to the members of the " pious sodality of the most sacred heart" of our Lord, indulgences are given annually of above 1600 years [1616 years and as many quarantines or periods of 40 days] besides 29 Plenary Indulgences; to which are added 12 more, Plenary, for the daily recitation of the Rosary, besides other lesser ones, as 300 days for every contrite repetition of the Rosary, and 60 days for every good work devoutly performed. (" The pious sodality, &c. 8th edit. with the approbation of the most Rev. Dr. Murray, &c.")

[1] Taken from " A dogmatical and practical treatise on Indulgences," abridged from Bouvier's Work, Dublin, 1839.

Cardinal Fisher also says [l],

"It weighs perhaps with many, that we lay such stress upon Indulgences, which are apparently of but recent usage in the Church, not being found among Christians, till a very late date."

It is clear, then, from this, that nothing which existed in the Primitive Church was contemplated by our Articles, as of course the doctrine of Absolution could not be, which, in its strongest form, our Church recognizes in the "Order for the Visitation of the sick." It condemns a doctrine, consequent upon the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory," and therefore, as well as that doctrine, unknown to the early centuries. The "godly discipline" of the Primitive Church, our own, in her yearly humiliation, professes her desire to restore, though as yet unable. But indeed the very term "pardons" or "indulgences" is notoriously a technical term for one specific doctrine connected with absolution, and does not relate to absolution itself, from which it is separated, as treated of by the Schoolmen. Thus Thomas Aquinas gives us a summary of P. Lombard's teaching on this head [m];

"*After* the 'master' had laid down as to penance and the power of the ministry, to whom the dispensation of this sacrament belongs, he here lays down some things, which follow upon penance, in two parts. In the first he lays

[l] Assert. Luth. conf. 18. quoted Tract 79, p. 50.

[m] In P. 4. dist. 20.

down the time of penance; in the second some things which relate to the defect of penance. The first falls into two heads; it shews 1) that the time of penance is to the end of life; 2) how they are to be dealt with, who repent at the end; and this is two-fold. He shews 1) how they who repent at the end of life, obtain remission of sins, although they are still debtors as to the temporal punishment, which they will endure in purgatory after death; 2) that the same punishment is owing to those, who in whatever way do not complete worthy satisfaction in this life, &c.'

Aquinas himself proposes his questions under the following heads[l];

" 1) whether any one can by repentance at the end of his life obtain pardon of sins; 2) whether the temporal punishment, the charge whereof remains after penitence, be estimated according to the amount of the fault; 3) whether any of the punishment, whereby satisfaction is made, can be remitted by indulgences; 4) whether any parochial priest can give an indulgence; 5) whether an indulgence avail to one in mortal sin."

" Indulgence" itself is thus defined[m]; " remission of temporal punishment, due to God for actual sin, given by the authority of the Church, exterior to the Sacrament, by the application of those satisfactions, which are laid up in the common treasure of the Church."

And the " temporal punishment" so spoken of not only includes the sufferings of Purgatory, but

[l] ib. q. 1. art. 1—5.

[m] Less. ad Thom. Aq. de Indulgent.

the chief character of Indulgences must necessarily be derived from it. The doctrine of Purgatory alone gives these their interest and importance. So long indeed as the shortening of the term of penance brought with it restoration to the communion of the Church, and in it to the participation of that Body and Blood, whereby we are cemented into the mystical Body of Christ, it was of course a great privilege; such it was in the practice of the early Church on which Romanists profess their "indulgences" to be founded [n]; the intercession of the martyrs, (although even it was abused [o] to "heal slightly" a grievous "wound,") in obtaining for the lapsed re-admission to the Holy Communion, did obtain for them inestimable privileges: again, an earlier reconciliation in the case of the dying was indeed a mercy, when in their extremities

[n] Dr. Wiseman, Lect. 12. on Indulgences, t. ii. p. 79. "The chief ground of indulgence or mitigation, and the one which most exactly includes all the principles of a modern indulgence, was the earliest, perhaps, admitted in the Church. When the martyrs, or those who were on the point of receiving the crown and had already attested their love of Christ by suffering, were confined in prison, those unfortunate Christians who had fallen [i. e. had abjured Christ under Heathen tortures] and were condemned to penance, had recourse to their mediation; and upon returning to the pastors of the Church with a written recommendation to mercy from one of those chosen servants of God and witnesses of Christ, were received at once to reconciliation, and absolved from the remainder of their penance."

[o] S. Cyprian complains of the practice in most of his letters on "the lapsed."

and last conflict it obtained for them the restoration of the "pledges of" their Saviour's "love," and placed them in Communion with Him: or, again, when in the prospect of persecution, they who had once denied the faith, were restored to Communion, in the hope that they might overcome wherein they had been overcome, this also was a great privilege that they were not left to such a conflict "unarmed, but were fortified with the protection of the Blood and the Body of Christ [p]." But when Communion came to be previously restored, and Indulgences were only "relaxations of temporal punishment," what great worth would they have, if confined to this life? Were they, as modern Romanists exhibit them [q], only a mitigation of penance enjoined by the Church, what great interest would they have? The wounded spirit would rather dread them than long for them; the true penitent would rather dread to be released entirely from the discipline and chastening, which are the correction and remedy of his former sins; he takes cheerfully the chastenings of God's own hand; he accepts gladly the austerities or priva-

[p] S. Cyprian, Ep. 57. (Fell) mentions both these cases: Dr. Wiseman, l. c. gives these as instances of early "indulgences."

[q] Thus Dr. Wiseman, l. c. drops all allusion to Purgatory. Dr. Butler only alludes to any thing, *not* in this life, thus slightly; "this atonement, *if considered in this life*, consists either in the penitential works prescribed in the canons, or imposed by the confessor." Lect. 5. "Objections against the several parts of the Sacrament of Penance."

tions or self-denials, which may tend to deepen his repentance and approve its sincerity. To what end to be free from a wholesome though bitter medicine? The history of ascetics of all times shews, that earnest repentance craves no "indulgences;" men's own experience will tell them, that a discipline in conformity with their sin is joyous as well as healthful. But when the doctrine of "satisfaction," instead of being the expression and means of contrition, became the discharge of a definite debt to Almighty God, and this debt, if not discharged or released in this life, was thought to be still due after death, and paid by the sufferings of purging fire, and that, the fire of hell, though for a time only, then indeed any relaxation of the "temporal punishment" did acquire an exceeding value, not for the sake of any thing in this life, but to shorten those extreme and unknown sufferings, which were believed to be greater than any thing in this life; which were intense as Hell; from which there was no rest day nor night; and to whose duration there was no certain limit, but the Day of Judgment. Any limitation of canonical penance shrinks into absolute insignificance, if not rather to be deprecated than to be purchased.

It is indeed remarkable, that Romanists admit that "Indulgences" do not supersede "penance," thereby shewing that "canonical penance," which they state to have been the object of that "mitigation which *most exactly* includes all the principles

of a modern indulgence[a]" is not the object of *their* "indulgences;" and they urge the continuance of "penance," even after obtaining "indulgences," on the very ground that the real end of both is not any thing in this life, but so to compensate to Divine Justice that the penitents be not after this life cast into Purgatory[b]. Purgatory then is the real end of the modern system of "indulgences" and "penance:" of "penance," in the Ancient Church, the end was, to escape Hell by furthering such repentance as made the sinner capable of God's mercies in Christ; the relaxations which Romanists parallel with their "indulgences," were restoration to the communion of the Church.

[b] Dr. Wiseman, see p. 95. n. n. "Indulgences of a hundred years or more, if there are such, may be insufficient to compensate the whole temporal punishment which a sinner is bound to pay . . Hence, thirdly, sinners truly converted ought to endeavour daily by good works [satisfactions] and indulgences, whether partial or plenary, to diminish the debts which they owe to Divine Justice and to compensate for them entirely in this life, lest they be sent to the prisons of purgatory, and do not come out thence till they have paid the last farthing." Bouvier de Pœnit. p. 301, quoted by Mr. Palmer, 3rd Letter to Dr. Wiseman, p. 7. "We do not believe an indulgence to imply any exemption from repentance . . . . . nor from the works of penance or other good works, because our Church teaches, that 'the life of a Christian ought to be a perpetual penance.' (Conc. Trid. de extr. Unct.) No one can ever be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of an indulgence, though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this end." Dr. Milner End of Controversy, Lett. 42, p. 304. 306. quoted ib.

"Pardons" then are altogether distinct from "pardon" through the power of the keys, because absolution relates to guilt, "pardons" to punishment; absolution is spiritual, "pardons" outward only; absolution, in whatever degree, alters a sinner's state towards God, "pardons" remit only a penalty due after restoration to God's favour; absolution restores to Communion, and opens the soul to the grace of the Sacrament, "pardons" follow upon restoration; absolution applies the power of the keys by virtue of Christ's authority committed to His ministers, "pardons," a certain treasure made up of the merits of Christ and of works of supererogation of His saints, supposed to be committed to the keeping of the Church; absolution applies God's mercy through the Satisfaction of His Son, "pardons" relate to a "satisfaction" still due from man to God; "pardons" are applied directly to the state of the soul after death, absolution only relates to it, in as far as it changes that state in this life; "pardons" presuppose absolution, absolution does not involve any doctrine of "pardons." Their provinces, offices, ends, comforts, value, are not less distinct than their scripturalness and primitiveness, absolution being derived from the distinct promise of our Lord, as understood by the Primitive and Catholic Church, "pardons" are founded on a precarious extension of the fact, of which Scripture also gives instances, that God does not always, with the guilt, remit the

punishment of sin, but which it neither declares to be His uniform rule, nor did His Church in her purer days believe that she had received from Him any influence in its suspension. Rather, the infliction or continuance of punishment, even after aggravated sin has been repented of, seems to have so important a place in the Divine government, and (it may be) to be so connected with the Divine Attributes, as not to admit of any interference. We see continually instances of it; in many cases, it is annexed by a regular law, so that sin, persisted in to a certain point, entails punishment by a natural consequence, i. e. by certain effects resulting from the sin according to a fixed rule and brought about by it; we do *not* see that when so annexed, it is ever remitted. The very Intercession of our Lord, which obtains the restoration of the offender to God's favour, is not, as far as we see, applied to it. It may be required, as I said, by the Moral Government of God or His Attributes, in some way we know not, that one who has sinned to a certain point, should remain under punishment in this life; it *may be*, that it is essential to such continued penitence as may be necessary for him; beyond this, we know nothing; it is a fact which we see and know in God's dealings with men, not a truth of Revelation. The Romanists have erred in assuming, 1) that it is uniform, 2) that it is a "satisfaction" to God's justice, 3) that it is a definite debt, which must be paid, and so if not

paid in this life, is to be paid in Purgatory, 4) that the Church can interfere with it.

This, however, is the sole province of "Indulgences." They take up the offender, where absolution leaves him, and are a supplement to it. Absolution frees him from guilt, leaves him (according to Romanists) with a debt upon him to Almighty God. This debt it is the office of Indulgences to abate or extinguish.

The Schoolmen, accordingly, rightly deny that Indulgences are a mere relaxation of Ecclesiastical penance[o],—or that they depend "simply on the power of the keys, (in which case they could have been given by Priests,) whereas they require, over and above, jurisdiction and the power of dispensing the Church's treasure, which ordinarily belongs to Bishops alone, as being the husbands of the Church, and so having the disposal of that dowry which she had from her betrothing to Christ[p]." Again, it is distinctly stated[q], that they "release not from guilt (which is the power of the keys), but from punishment."

The connection of "Indulgences" with Purgatory, which Romanists among ourselves now suppress, is thus asserted by the Schoolmen.

"It[r] is most truly assumed, that the treasure of the

[o] Bonav. iv. Dist. 20. q. 2.
[p] ib. q. 3.
[q] ib. q. 4.
[r] Alex. Alens. 4. q. 24. Memb. 5. add Bonavent. iv. Dist. 20.

Church is in the power of the Pope, and that he can communicate its benefits to them, (since on account of the charity wherein they departed they are fit objects to receive the benefits of the Church,) and thus he can grant them indulgences and relaxations."

"As by God[s] eternal punishment is changed into purgatorial, so by the priests purgatorial punishment into temporal."

"That[t] Indulgences profit the departed, who are detained in Purgatory, if applied to them by the Church, is certain, and the contrary is a heresy, or most close upon a heresy."

Only the mode of application differs, it being generally ruled, that since the departed are removed out of the jurisdiction of the Church into that of God, the Pope can no longer bestow these Indulgences as a judicial act, but only in the way of obtaining the relaxation from God.

"The relaxation[u] may take place by the way of suffrage or impetration, and not by that of judicial absolution or commutation."

"Those[x] who are in Purgatory, Indulgences profit not directly, yet indirectly they do profit them."

Even this, however, is matter of doubt among them. Ricardus de Media Villa, in citing a form of

c. 5. who quotes also S. Thom. Suppl. 3. p. q. 27. art. 1. Brulef. iv. Dist. 20. q. 8. Pet. de Tarantas. ib. q. 22. Ric. de Med. Villa, ib. art. 3. q. 3.

[s] Al. Alens. ib. memb. 3.

[t] Less. in S. Thomam de Indulg. c. 5.

[u] Alex. Alens. l. c.

[x] Ric. de Med. Vill. l. c.

indulgence given for one departed, says, that this is the opinion of "some" only.

"Whoever[y] shall do this or that for himself or for his departed father, or for any other person, being in Purgatory, we give so many days' indulgence, but so, *according to some*, they do not profit them, except in the way of suffrage."

"It is the common opinion[z], that Indulgences are only bestowed by the way of compensation or of suffrage."

The extent to which they were carried is singularly illustrated by the question, discussed by the Schoolmen generally, "whether Indulgences avail as much as they promise"—so large were they, that it was argued, that "since merits were now so few, that a person could scarcely suffice for himself, the Church's treasure must have been long exhausted[a];" so vague, that they promised for the same act, (whether it cost much to the individual or no,) the same relaxation, as of "the third part of his penance[b]," whether it were ten or thirty years. Their moral effect is illustrated by the question, "whether if one in the prospect of the plenary remission of a jubilee committed more grievous

[y] l. c.

[z] Less. l. c.

[a] Bonav. iv. Dist. 20. q. 6. where there are quoted Alex. Alens. iv. p. q. 23. Memb. 2. S. Tho. in suppl. 3. p. q. 25. art. 1. Richard. iv. Sent. dist. 20. art. 3. q. 2. Brulef. ib. q. 9. Pet. de Tarant. ib. q. 22.

[b] Bonav. ib.

sin, (reserved cases) he would derive the benefits of it?" This is affirmed to be the most probable[c].

There is then ample proof that the doctrine and practice condemned in the Article is (as our friend stated) "not every doctrine about pardons, but a certain doctrine, the Romish doctrine, as indeed the plural form itself shews," and this as he further states, "the doctrine maintained and acted on in the Roman Church, that remission of the *penalties* of sin in the next life may be obtained by the power of the Pope, with such abuses as money payments consequent thereupon[d]."

3. *Invocation of Saints.*

The distinctions between the "Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints" and any practice which may be found in the early Church, (although itself also not primitive or Catholic, but rather the vent of individual feeling,) have been so clearly and fully pointed out by an unsuspected authority, Archbishop Ussher, that one need but have referred to his work. It is one thing, however, to acknowledge a thing, another to have it vividly before our

[c] Less. ad Aq. cap. de Indulg. fin.

[d] This in Ed. 1. stood, "large and reckless indulgences from the penalties of sin obtained on money payments." In either case, the distinctive character of the doctrine was pointed out, an assumed release from the *penalties* of sin.

eyes; and it is of so much moment to us on all sides, as well as to the Roman Church, to have a distinct perception of the difference between the early and the later practice, that I will set down the heads of Archbishop Ussher's contrasts, and at length subjoin the specimens which he gives of the later practice; painful as is the exhibition of so much that is shocking in the devotions of a Christian Church. The differences then noted by Archbishop Ussher are these: 1) that in the Ancient Church, mental addresses were confined to God, as knowing the thoughts; in the Romish, are made to the saints also. 2) In the Ancient Church, they spoke doubtfully, whether the Saints know the details of our wants; in the Romish, it is held as a point of faith that they hear men's prayers. 3) In the Ancient, the Saints were applied to only in the same way as the living; in the Romish, "formal and absolute prayers are tendered to them." 4) In the Ancient, they are addressed only as joint petitioners; in the Romish, as advocates and mediators by virtue of their own merits also. 5) In the Ancient, the seeking the prayers of the Saints interfered not with our "boldness to approach the throne of grace;" in the Romish, the Saints are held out as an easier and more acceptable way for a sinner to approach to God. 6) In the Ancient, persons were taught chiefly to look to their own prayers; in the Romish, to the intercession of Saints.

7) " And principally," in the Ancient Church, the prayers of the Saints were requested as fellow-servants; in the Romish, " invocation is attributed as a part of the worship due to them, in Bellarmine's words ' an eminent kind of adoration.' "

These are mostly so many several ways of exhibiting how the ancient compellations of the Saints had no tendency to efface the thought of the " One God and the One Mediator between God and man," or to stop short in them; which is miserably the tendency of much, encouraged by the Roman practice. In the Ancient Church, no service was asked of them, which might not be also rendered conjointly by our brethren on earth, nothing asked different in kind, nothing said which could even *seem* to centre in them; they are not avenues of approaching to God, but, as part of the Church, joint intercessors with the members who are in the flesh; nor, in asking their prayers, is *any office or service to them contemplated.* In forms, on the contrary, used in the Church of Rome, the Saints are (as far as the words go) asked absolutely to render offices, which are in the power of God only; if these prayers can be explained in any other sense, this is not their obvious meaning; the words do not lead up to God, but in themselves rather lead away from Him, by resting in the creature; they ask of St. Mary and of the Saints to " loose, heal, give life, &c." and do not suggest that they cannot do this by any power

entrusted to them, much less by any virtue of their own; the Saints are proposed for the time as the objects in which devotion is to centre; and, if it be possible that some can use such prayers in a sound sense, still their tendency, and their actual effect upon the multitude, is to bind them down to the Saints, in whom the language terminates; and this the more, since devotion to the Saints is on principle encouraged.

This last point, which Archbishop Ussher gives as a "principal" difference between the prayers of the Ancient and Romish Church, is of the more moment practically, because the same act will have a very different character, according to the frame of mind in which it is performed. Could Romanists shew ever so much (which they can not) that the direct forms "help me, heal me,") much less "do thou give heaven, remit sin,") were used in the Ancient Church, in insulated cases[c], this would

[c] To take the only case in Antiquity of any account, (for the rest alleged by Dr. Wiseman in his recent "Remarks" are either spurious or nothing to the purpose,) the virgin Justina mentioned by S. Gregory. All which can be collected from it is, that having prayed at much length to The Father and our Lord, she in some way "besought the *Virgin* Mary to aid a *virgin* in danger:" we have not the words she used; those of S. Gregory from the very antithesis are evidently oratorical; they do not imply that she said in the modern Roman way "help me." She may only have asked her prayers; this quite satisfies the language, and since we do not find the other form in those times, it is probable that she did no more. S. Gregory's relation is; "Abandoning all other hope, she flees to God for refuge,

not bear out the modern Romish practice, in which they are systematically a part of devotion. An address to a saint, as the result of a momentary feeling, is very different from habitual prayers to them, *as devotion*. The one tends to substitute them in the place of God, the other does not. The one proposes them as an object of "worship, adoration," or whatever it may be called; the other does not. It matters not whether in the abstract it be called latreia or douleia; that which makes the modern prayers to the Saints so sore an evil, is that these prayers are recommended as devotion; the mind of the worshipper is directed to the Saints; the prayers offered to them, in their obvious sense terminate in them; it must require a strong effort of mind and much fixedness on God, to supply another sense than what is the obvious meaning of the words; and few who have observed their own habits of mind in prayer will think that such forms as "do thou give heaven, do thou loose, do thou heal, do thou remit sin, lead, conduct thou to glory, preserve thou, help thou, take away [sin], give life," addressed to a creature, are not

and takes as her defender, against that accursed passion, Him to Whom she was betrothed." Then having given specimens of her prayers to our Lord, he adds, "Having uttered these things, and *much beside*, and beseeching the Virgin Mary to aid a virgin in danger," &c. (*τὴν παρθένον Μαρίαν ἱκετεύουσα βοηθῆσαι παρθένῳ κινδυνευούσῃ.*) S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 24. §. 10. 11. How different this in tone from the sad extracts in Archbishop Ussher. On other authorities quoted by Romanists, see below, p. 115. note.

a grievous snare, that they do not tempt people to idolatry, and must not, too probably, for the most part, end in it.

It is not our office to judge the Church of Rome, though it is an act of charity to her to warn her what a grievous scandal these things are, even in our eyes as men, and to remind her of the woe denounced on those "who offend one of these little ones who believe in" Christ, if so be she may have grace given her at last, herself formally to condemn what, although she has never formally sanctioned, yet still she has encouraged. Meanwhile for our immediate purpose, it appears from this, that there is a "Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints" wholly distinct from any thing in the Church of the 4th Century, holding them out as mediators preferable to our Lord, commending devotion to them as a religious act, asking them not merely to "pray for us," but to give us what we pray for. There is then, on this ground, no reason to think that our Article in condemning "the Romish doctrine," or "the doctrine of the Schoolmen," on this point, had any reference to any thing found in the early Church, being wholly distinct from it. The painful evidence given by Archbishop Ussher of this sad declension of the Roman Church, is so detailed and so long, that it must be kept for another place[d].

This same distinction between the Romish Invocation of Saints and the earlier occasional addresses

[d] Note A. at the end.

to them is also thus clearly drawn out in a valuable and full statement by Thorndike[e].

"I will distinguish three sorts of prayers to Saints, whether taught or allowed to be taught in the Church of Rome. The first is of those that are made to God, but to desire His blessings by and through the merits and intercession of His Saints. I cannot give so fit an example, as out of the Canon of the Mass, which all the Western Churches of that Communion do now use. There it is said, 'Communicating in and reverencing the memory of such and such of all Thy Saints, by whose merit and prayer grant that in all things we may be guarded by Thy protection and help.' There is also a short prayer for the Priest to say, when he comes to the altar, as he finds opportunity, 'We pray Thee, Lord, by the merits of the Saints, whose reliques are here, and all Saints; that thou wouldest vouchsafe to release me all my sins.' And on the first Sunday in Advent mentioning the Blessed Virgin, they pray, 'That we who believe her truly the Mother of God, may be helped by her intercession with Thee.'"

"The second is that which their Litanies contain.—The form of them is manifest, that whereas you have in them sometimes, 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' 'Christ, have mercy upon us,' 'Holy Trinity, One God, have mercy upon us;' you have much oftener the Blessed Virgin repeated again and again, under a number of her attributes; you have also all the Saints and Angels, or such as the present occasion pretends for the object of the devotion which a man tenders, named and spoken to, with, 'Ora pro nobis,' i. e. Pray for us. The Blessed Virgin some say with 'Te rogamus audi nos,' We beseech thee to hear us. One thing I must not forget to observe, that the prayers, which follow these Litanies, are almost

[e] Epilogue, b. iii. p. 356 sqq.

all of the first kind; that is to say, addressed directly to God, but mentioning the intercession of Saints or Angels for the means to obtain our prayers at His hands.

"The third is when they desire immediately of them the same blessings, spiritual and temporal, which all Christians desire of God. There is a Psalter to be seen, with the name of God changed every where into the name of the Blessed Virgin. There is a book of devotion in French with this title; 'Moyen de bien servir, prier, et adorer la Vierge Marie,' The way well to serve, pray to, and adore the Blessed Virgin. There are divers forms of prayer as well as private speeches, concerning her especially and other Saints, quoted in the Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 303—345. Of those then, the first kind seem to me utterly agreeable with Christianity, importing only the exercise of that Communion which all members of God's Church hold with all members of it, ordained by God, for the means to obtain for one another the grace which the obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ hath purchased for us without difference, whether dead or alive; because, we stand assured that they have the same affection for us, dead or alive; so far as they know us and our estate, and are obliged to desire and esteem their prayers for us, as for all the members of Christ's mystical body. Neither is it in reason conceivable that all Christians from the beginning should make them the occasion of their devotions as I said, out of any consideration but this. For, as concerning the term 'merit' perpetually frequent in those prayers, it hath been always maintained by those of the Reformation that it is not used by the Latin Fathers, in any other sense than that which they allow. Therefore the Canon of the Mass and probably other prayers which are still in use, being more ancient than the greatest part of the Latin Fathers, there is no reason to make any difficulty of admitting it in that sense, the ground whereof I have maintained in the second book.

"The third, taking them at the foot of the letter, and valuing the intent of those that use them by nothing but the words of them, are mere idolatries; as desiring of the creature that which God only gives, which is the worship of the creature for the Creator, 'God blessed for evermore.' And, were we bound to make the acts of them that teach these prayers the acts of the Church, because it tolerates them and maintains them in it, instead of casting them out, it would be hard to free that Church from idolatry; which whoso admitteth, can by no means grant it to be a Church, the being whereof supposeth the worship of One God, exclusive to any thing else. But the words of them are capable of the same limitation that I gave to the words of our Lord when I said, that they whom Christians do good to here, may be said to receive them into everlasting habitations, because God does it in consideration of them, and of the good done them. And so when Irenæus calls the Virgin Mary the advocate of Eve, (v. 19.) he that considers his words there and iii. 33. shall find that he saith it, not because she prayed for him, but because she believed the Angel's message, and submitted to God's will, and so became the means of saving all, though by our Lord Christ, Who pleadeth even for her as well as Eve. Ground enough there is for such a construction; even the belief of One God alone, that stands at the head of our Creed, which we have no reason to think the Church allows them secretly to renounce, whom she alloweth to make these prayers. And therefore no ground to construe them so, as if the Church, by allowing them, did renounce the ground of all her Christianity. *But not ground enough to satisfy a reasonable man, that all that make them do hold that infinite distance between God and His Saints and Angels, of whom they demand the same effects, which if they hold not, they are idolaters as the Heathen were:* who being convinced of one Godhead, as the Fathers challenge to their faces, divided it into one prin-

cipal, and divers that by His gift are such. *How shall I presume, that simple Christians, in the devotions of their hearts, understand that distance of God from His creatures which their words signify not? which the wisest of their teachers will be much troubled to say, by what figure of speech they can allow it?* Especially if it be considered how little reason or interest in religion there can be to advance this reverence of Christian people towards the Saints or Angels so far above the reason and ground, which ought to be the spring-head of it. For so far are we from any tradition of the Catholic Church for this, that the admonition of Epiphanius to the Collyridians takes hold of it.—So doth the admonition of S. Ambrose[a] (in Rom. i.) to them who reserve nothing to God, that they give not to His servants. So doth that of S. Augustine, (de Vera Rel. cap. lv.) that our religion is not to consist in worshipping the dead; and that an Angel forbad S. John to worship him, but only God; Whose fellow-servants they were. So doth the argument of S. Gregory Nyssene, (contra Eunom. iv.) and Athanasius, (contra Arian. iii.) concluding our Lord to be God, because He is worshipped, which Cornelius was forbid by S. Peter, S. John by the the Angel, to do to them, saith Athanasius.

" In fine, so dangerous is the case, that whoso communicateth in it, is no way reasonably assured that he communicateth not in the worship of Idols. Only the Church of England having acknowledged the Church of Rome a true Church, though corrupt, ever since the Reformation, I am obliged so to interpret the prayers thereof, as to acknowledge the corruption so great, that the prayers which it alloweth, may be idolatries, if they be made in that sense which they may properly signify: but not that they are necessarily idolatries. For if they were necessarily idolatries, then were the Church of Rome necessarily no Church; the being of Christianity presupposing the wor-

[a] Ambrosiaster.

ship of One true God. And though, to confute the Heretics, the style of modern devotions leaves nothing to God, which is not attributed to and desired of His Saints; yet it cannot be denied they may be the words of them who believe that God alone can give that which they desire.

"The second sort, it is confessed, had the beginning in the flourishing times of the Church after Constantine [m]. The lights of the Greek and Latin Church, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyrils both, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, Leo, more or rather all after that time, have all of them spoken to the Saints departed, and desired their assistance. But neither is this enough to make a tradition of the Church. For the Church had been three hundred years before it began. Irenæus is mistaken, when he is alleged for it, as I said even now. Card. Bellarmine alleges out of Eusebius de Preparat. xiii. 10. 'We make our prayers to them.' But the Greek bears only, 'We make our prayers to God at their monuments.' Athanasius de Sanctissima Deipara, whom he quotes, is certainly of a later date than Athanasius [n]. Out of S.

[m] Dr. Butler, (Lect. 12. p. 307.) alleging this passage, omits Thorndike's statement that this practice began in the times of Constantine, and quotes the rest thus, "It is confessed, adds the learned and impartial Thorndike, that *all* the Fathers both of the Greek and Latin Churches, &c." to "assistance."

[n] Still quoted by Dr. Wiseman thus, "S. Athanasius, the most zealous and strenuous supporter, that the Church ever possessed, of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and consequently of His infinite superiority over all the saints, thus enthusiastically addresses His ever-blessed Mother," (Lect. 13. p. 108.) yet the very edition from which he professes to quote, the Benedictine, pronounces the work spurious. It is quoted also by Dr. Butler, Lect. 3. "The singular devotion of the Catholic Church to the Blessed Virgin Mary justified." p. 103. On the same subject

Hilary I see nothing brought nor remember any thing to be brought to that purpose. In fine, after Constantine, when the Festivals of the Saints, being publicly celebrated, occasioned the confluence of Gentiles as well as Christians, and innumerable things were done, which seemed miracles done by God, to attest the honour done them, and the truth of Christianity which it supposed, I acknowledge those great lights did think fit to address themselves to them as petitioners; but so at the first, as those that were no ways assured by our common Christianity, that their petitions arrived at their knowledge. You have seen S. Augustine acknowledge that they must come by such means, as God is no way tied to furnish. Greg. Nazianz.

Mr. Phillips in a solitary quotation from the Fathers, alleges in justification of the shocking Psalter, called St. Bonaventure's, "the great S. Augustine;" yet the Benedictines again call the homily, (which is given to S. Augustine in the Breviary,) "the work of some unskilful patchwork-maker." (on Serm. 194. App. al. de Sanctis 18.) Again, Dr. Wiseman in his recent Letter to Mr. Palmer, quotes confidently on the same subject, as words of S. Ephraem, certain prayers found mostly in a solitary *Greek* MS. which the Benedictine editors themselves give not as S. Ephraem's, but an unknown Monk's, called Thecaras. Nor is it even said that they are *collected* from S. Ephraem's writings; they are simply appended to some prayers for the subduing of the passions, which are said to be so collected. The prayers are certainly not S. Ephraem's; the style is wholly unlike the richness of that father's language. They are of the same stamp as what Cave (Hist. Lit. s. tit.) calls, sequiorum sæculorum deliramentum. Yet on this authority, Dr. W. quotes "S. Ephraem Syrus, the friend of S. Basil, as using prayers which go far beyond what [Roman] Catholics are in the habit of using now-a-days." Again, he quotes as S. Gregory of Nazianzum's, the Christus Patiens, which both the Benedictines and the recent editor pronounce not to be his, and the Benedictines say of the words, that "they savour at least of the age of Damascene, or even one much later than the 8th or 9th." Romanist citations of the fathers always require to be sifted; their system not being really founded on Antiquity, but on the authority of the existing Church, they are careless how they quote.

speaks to Gorgonia in his oration upon her, and to Constantius, in his first oration against Julian, but under a doubtful condition, if they were sensible of what he spake. Enough to distinguish praying to God, from any address to a creature, though religion be the ground of it. And when the apparitions about their monuments were held unquestionable, yet it was questioned, whether the same soul would be present at once in places of so much distance, or Angels appear like them, as you may see in the answer aforesaid, p. 391. 394. Nay, Hugo de S. Victore in Cassander, Epist. xix. hath enabled him to hold, that the Litanies do not suppose that the Saints hear them, and therefore are expounded by some to signify conditional desires, if God grant them to come to their knowledge. But of that I speak not yet, only as it enables me to conclude, that this kind of prayer is not idolatry. This necessarily follows from the premises; because a man cannot take that Saint or Angel for God, whose prayers he desires;—but manifestly shews that his desire is grounded upon the relation which he thinks he hath to him, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by His Church. Nevertheless, though it be not idolatry, the consequence and production of it not being distinguishable from idolatry, the Church must needs stand obliged to give it those bounds that may prevent such mischief as that which shall make it no Church."—

It were well if the Romish Church, which so gladly pleads in her behalf the charitable allowances made by Thorndike, that he need not necessarily pronounce her idolatrous, although she tolerates what leads to idolatry, would also consider his warning against her sanctioning practices, which naturally lead to it, and his strong conviction that the existence of such practices, unforbidden by authority, must be "one of the most considerable titles," as for our original "reformation without consent of the whole," so also for continued

separation. It is sad to see a serious person [o] thus defend the Invocation, "deliver us, holy Virgin Mary;"

"Why do not such persons compile a 'dictionary' or a 'speaker's assistant;' in which we may find words to express fully and adequately our thoughts, and the different tempers and motives of our minds?"

Such language, and that cited by Archbishop Ussher, is not only liable to be taken in an unsound sense, but the unsound is its obvious meaning.

Thorndike then thus proceeds;

"Suppose a simple soul can distinguish between Ora pro nobis, and Domine miserere; between 'Pray for us,' and 'Lord have mercy upon us;' how shall I be assured, that it distinguishes between the honour that Pagans gave the less gods, under Jupiter the Father of Gods, and that which himself gives the Saints, under the God of those Saints? And is it enough, that the Church enjoins not nor teaches idolatry? Is it not further bound to secure us against it? I know not whether it can be said that Processions and Litanies are voluntary devotions, which the people are not answerable for, if they neglect. They were first brought in, and since frequented at the instance of Prelates, and their Clergy; and if they be amiss, the people are snared by their means: that is, by the Church, if the Church bear them out in it. And by these three sorts of Prayers, it appears that without giving bounds to private conceits, there is [no] means to stop men's course from that extremity, which whether it be real idolatry or not, nothing can assure us. Upon these terms I stand. I have heard those relations, upon credit not to be ques-

[o] Dr. Butler, Lect. 12. p. 360.

tioned, which make their devotions to Saints hardly distinguishable from the idolatries of Pagans. That they who preferred them could not, or did not, distinguish, I say not. In fine, they demonstrate manifold more affection for the Blessed Virgin, or some particular Saints, than for our Lord. That they call not upon Saints to pray for them, but to help them; that they neither express nor can be presumed to mean by praying for, but by granting their prayers; in fine, *that they demonstrate inward subjection of the heart wherein idolatry consists;* I cannot disbelieve those who relate what they see done. What may be the reason, why to them rather than to God?"

"I grant it no Idolatry, that is, not *necessarily* any Idolatry, to pray to Saints to pray for us. The very matter implies an equivocation in the word 'praying,' which nothing hinders the heart to distinguish. But is it fit for the Church to maintain it, because it is necessarily no Idolatry? I grant, 'Ora pro nobis' in the Litanies might be taken for the ejaculation of a desire, which a man knows not whether it is heard or not; (as some instance in a letter, which a man would write, though uncertain whether it shall come to hand or not;) and I could wish that the people were taught so much by the form, as a powerful means to preserve the distance between God and His creature alive in their esteem. I count it not fit for a private person to say, what might be condescended to, for the re-union of the Church, stopping the way upon those mischiefs, which the flourishing times of the Church have not prevented. While all bounds are refused, all extremities maintained, I allege it for one of the most considerable titles for reformation without the consent of the whole."

Enough will now have been said to vindicate the distinction between the occasional addresses, which occur in the fourth century, requesting the

prayers of the Saints, and the systematic devotions prevalent in the Romish Church, requesting their aid absolutely, and preferring them, upon system, to immediate application to our Lord. Since this distinction is so broad, and appeared so to such writers as Archbishops Ussher and Bramhall [a], Bp. Andrews [b], and Thorndike, there is clearly no ground, why we should suppose that our Article, in condemning the "Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints," had any reference to these addresses of the fourth century. At the same time, persons cannot be too strongly warned against the risk to their own souls, in resuming, even in its lightest form, a practice, which does not come recommended to us by the Primitive Church, and which Scripture, to say the least, in principle, discourages; which, as a *systematic* practice, does not seem to be countenanced even by the age in which it was introduced, the addresses in the fourth century being rather apostrophes to the blessed Saints who were at the moment before the minds of those who used them, than systematic requests for their intercession. And yet even this alone would obviously make a great difference in the religious influence of such addresses; the *systematic* application for their intercessions has

[a] Works, p. 418, quoted in Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 14.

[b] Answer to c. 20. of Card. Perron's Reply, p. 57—62, quoted Tract 90, p. 41, 2.

manifestly a tendency, which such occasional apostrophes as we find in the fourth century at all events have not, to give them a place in our thoughts which should be occupied only by the One Intercessor. Systematic addresses to them constitute them, so far, direct objects of our devotions, which having, as our friend observes, "less of awe and severity," may be gradually resorted to in preference, in order to "save men the necessity of lifting up their minds to their Sanctifier and their Judge." It is to be considered, whether *habitual* addresses to the Saints do not, in the mildest form, imply that they are *themselves*, in some degree, objects of devotion. In the case of friends on earth, with which these addresses are paralleled, we are content to ask their intercessions once for all, or as an emergency occurs; we do not habitually ask them to "pray for us;" we take it for granted that they do; the continual use then of these supplications to the Saints, (who, as being purified, must love us better, and be more ready to pray for us than our friends on earth,) seems in itself to imply that some other feeling has crept in, beyond the wish to secure their intercessions; that people apply to them, as a vent to their feelings; that they have unconsciously made them ends and objects of devotion, and are thereby associating other objects in their devotional feelings with their One lawful Object, our Maker, Redeemer, Sanctifier; are learning to

have recourse to them, together with Him and in His place. There is also in itself so much risk in addressing prayers to one unseen, who is not God; it is, on the one hand, so much an act of devotion, and on the other, our devotions to God are at best so imperfect, so little elevated, that there is on this ground alone much risk, lest the acts of devotion to the creature and to the Creator should be of the same kind, and so those to the creature idolatrous. The very fact that we find these appeals first in very holy men, may be (as our friend observes) a ground to discourage such as we are, not to encourage us; the less like them we are, the less should we imitate them in this one point. "It[c] is nothing to the purpose to urge the example of such men as S. Bernard, in defence of such invocations. The holier the man, the less likely they are to be injurious to him; but it is another matter entirely when ordinary persons do the same." There would be also an especial risk in such practices in our own Church, beyond what there is even in the Romish; they do not come recommended to *us* by our immediate Mother, any more than by the Church Catholic; one who should adopt them, would do so on doubtful precedents, and on his own "private judgment;" he would do it altogether on his own responsibility, as his own act, contrary to what his Church deems advisable for

[c] Mr. Newman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 19. The whole page is a very valuable warning.

her children generally, and as I said, having no sanction (as in the case of prayers for the Saints at rest) from the Church Catholic; he ought also to have fears lest he be actuated herein by mixed motives, such as imagination, excitement, novelty, and so to doubt the lawfulness of the action in himself, over and above its abstract questionableness: he can, or ought, hardly to feel absolutely assured of its propriety, and ought then well to consider, why he does not come under the Apostle's rule, "He that doubteth is damned if he eat, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Lastly, if any ever so much desire to have the intercession of those, who see their Redeemer face to face, it is so safe to ask Him to put in their minds to pray Him for them, so unsafe to apply to them directly, that they must, surely, feel that they are exposing themselves very gratuitously to risk in adopting a practice to which there are so many grave objections, when the object they have at heart can be obtained more surely, because sought for more humbly, without it.

I need only, in conclusion, express the earnest hope, in which you will so strongly join, that any one, who after the example of our friend, finds himself called upon to give an opinion that "the *ora pro nobis* is not necessarily included in the Invocation of Saints, which the Article condemns," will follow him also in expressing his "great apprehension concerning the use even of such modified

invocations[d]." And altogether, the less such a subject is discussed, obviously the better; the very mention of it may prove a snare to some minds, who are not trained in those feelings of reverence, which happily prevail in this place; it is not and ought not to be a practical question to us; but the abstract discussion of questions involving great practical consequences, yet unfelt by those discussing them, is too likely to divest the mind of those feelings of solemn responsibility without which no religious question can be discussed without injury.

4, 5. *Veneration and worshipping of Images and Relics.*

The less need be said on this, the remaining subject of this Article, because, although the feeling of the Ancient Church with regard to relics was very different from that common now, there was no view in any part of it which any way approximated to the Romish doctrine or practice. On the contrary, the primitive doctrine and prac-

[d] Meanwhile, it is very comforting to see younger men also alive to this especial danger, "Through the course which Mr. N. has now been obliged to take, the 'ora pro nobis' may have been brought before persons, who would otherwise never have thought of it, and who may take it up from the mere affectation of singularity or what may be called a restless love of newly seen and dimly apprehended truth." A Few More Words in Support of No. 90, &c. by Rev. W. G. Ward.

tice, on the subject of images, was so strict, that the difficulty would rather be to reconcile the "having" images at all, with it; of worship or outward reverence there was no trace. I will not here repeat what I hope shortly to give at length; I will only then mention to you the result of a careful examination, in which I sifted every thing alleged about images in the early centuries. This I have thus summed up[e];

"1. In the three first centuries it is positively stated that the Christians had no images. 2. Private individuals had pictures, but it was discouraged. (Aug.) 3. The Cross, not the Crucifix, was used; the first mention of the Cross in a Church is in the time of Constantine. 4. The first mention of pictures in Churches (except to forbid them) is at the end of the fourth century; and these, historical pictures from the O. T. or of martyrdoms, not of individuals. 5. No account of any picture of our Lord being publicly used occurs in the six first centuries, (the first is in Leontius Neap. l. v. Apol. pro Christian. A. D. 600.) 6. Outward reverence to pictures is condemned." [And this as late as Gregory M., who speaks in his genuine works very decisively against outward reverence to images, the passage apologizing for it being spurious.]

One cannot again imagine any thing more strikingly opposed to the Romish apologies for their worship before images, or a more valuable warning against their peril, than the following passage of S. Augustine[f];

[e] Library of the Fathers; Tertullian. Note B. on Apology, p. 116.

[f] In Ps. 113. Serm. 2. §. 5.

" Who worships or prays, *looking upon an image*, and does not become so affected as to think that he is heard by it, as to hope that what he longs for will be granted him by it?—Against this feeling, whereby human and carnal infirmity may easily be ensnared, the Scripture of God utters things well known, whereby it reminds and rouses as it were the minds of men, slumbering in the accustomed things of the body ; ' The images of the heathen,' it says, ' are silver and gold.' " He then (§. 6.) meets the objection, that the Christians too had *vessels* of silver and gold, the works of men's hands, for the service of the Sacraments. " But," he asks, " have they mouths, and speak not ? have they eyes, and see not ? do we pray to them, in that, through them, we pray to God ? This is the chief cause of that frantic ungodliness, that a form, like one living, has more power over the feelings of the unhappy beings, causing itself to be worshipped, than the plain fact that it is not living, so that it ought to be despised by the living. For images are of more avail to bow down the unhappy mind (in that they have mouth, have eyes, have ears, have nostrils, have hands, have feet,) than it hath to correct it that they speak not, see not, hear not, smell not, touch not, walk not."

With regard to " relics" on the other hand, the later corruptions have given a turn to our *feelings*, at variance with those of the early Church, though their practice did not differ from our's. The Roman practice condemned, appears, from the Homilies, to have been the " offering incense[h]" to the reliques ; and of this or of any other outward veneration to them, no traces are pretended to be

[h] Homily on Good Works, P. 2. p. 54. On Peril of Idolatry, P. 3. p. 220, 249.

found in the Ancient Church. Those who love the early Church have to regret a tone of mind, which seems estranged from her's; yet was there nothing in her practice which modern notions could include under the censure of "veneration of relics." There is no question then as to the interpretation of the Article; only as to the tone of mind of those who expound them, lest they speak slightingly of sacred feelings, and, as I said, foster the principle of rejecting the evidence of miracles, like the Jews or modern Deists, on à priori grounds. The feeling about relics, too common among us, is sadly natural. Who would not of himself love, as they of old did, the ashes of the "noble army of martyrs?" or whose eyes would not gush out with tears at sight of a fragment of the true Cross? who would not (in St. Jerome's[1] words) "worship prostrate before it, as though he saw the Lord hanging thereon?" who can even realize to himself the awful reality of what he should feel? and yet, in proportion as he would love them, if he had ground to believe them real, he must grieve over the avarice of men, which so multiplied them, that our later Church knows not where she has them. Nor is it strange that the lying miracles of later days, connected with supposed relics, should create a repugnance to believe true miracles, wrought by God in connection with the true. Yet to persist, against evidence, to deny earlier miracles, were to act

[1] In vit. Paulæ Ep. 108. §. 9.

upon passion, not on the love of the truth. Rather, since God did work miracles by them in those days, one should, on that ground, adhere the more closely to that Faith, which He attested by miracles, and the more look with reverence and longing to those holy days, when God vouchsafed to form saints whom He crowned with martyrdom, and copy the practices whereby they were so formed, and seek by a holy life the indwelling of that Holy Spirit, which so hallowed even the "dry bones" of those who had been so eminently His temple, that they still "lived," and "being dead, yet spake," and became to others the source of earthly, and thereby also of spiritual, life and healing.

The several instances of the respect paid by the Ancient Church to "relics" are embodied in the following vindication by Thorndike[1]; in which no one of our Church, (whatever vague impressions he may have had,) will probably find any thing which he would wish to gainsay.

"He that could wish, that the memories of the Martyrs, and other Saints who lived so as to assure the Church they would have been Martyrs had they been called to it, had not been honoured, as it is plain they were honoured by Christians, must find in his heart by consequence to wish that Christianity had not prevailed. For, this honour, depending on nothing but assurance of their happiness, in them that remained alive, was that which moved unbelievers to bethink themselves of the

[1] Epilogue iii. 30. p. 354.

reason they had to be Christians. What were then those honours? Reverence in preserving the remains of their bodies and burying them, celebrating the remembrance of their agonies every year, assembling themselves at their monuments, making the days of their death festivals, the place of burial Churches, building and consecrating Churches to the service of God in remembrance of them, I will add further, (for the custom seemeth to come from undefiled Christianity,) burying the remains of their bodies under the stones upon which the Eucharist was celebrated. What was there in all this but Christianity? That the circumstances of God's service, which no law of God had limited, the time, the place, the occasion of assembling for the service of God (always acceptable to God) should be determined by such glorious accidents for Christianity, as the departure of those, who had thus concluded their race. What can be so properly counted the reign of the Saints and Martyrs with Christ, which St. John foretelleth, Apoc. xx. as this honour, when it came to trample Paganism under feet, after the conversion of Constantine? Certainly, nothing can be named, so correspondent to that honour which is prophesied for them that suffered for God's law, under Antiochus Epiphanes. Dan. xii. Is not all this honour properly derivative from the honour of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and relative to His service? For, that is the work for which Christians assemble, and for those assemblies the Church stands, as I have often said; the honour of the Saints, but the occasion, circumstance, or furniture for it."

Art. xxxii.

"Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage."

"There is," as our friend said, "no subject for controversy in these words, since even the most determined advocates of the celibacy of the clergy admit their truth." Not only S. Jerome, whom he quotes, but even modern Romanists rest clerical celibacy on ecclesiastical rule, not on "God's law." On the other hand, it should be observed, that the tone of the Article is contrary to men's modern practice; it does not take it for granted, as a matter of course, that clergymen will marry, as soon as they can provide for a family; as if this were obviously the best both for themselves and those committed to them; but it implies, as does the Marriage Service for all, that it is a matter of Christian prudence and wisdom to decide, in which estate, married or single, they may best serve the Lord, and that they will decide, not with a view to earthly joy, but "as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

A contemporary document implies the feeling of those times to have been in favour of the celibacy of the Clergy; our Marriage Service goes further, and, in the midst of its touching commendation of the "honourable estate" of matrimony, implies a holy celibacy to be for those to

whom it is given, a higher state. For in that it speaks of "continency" as a "gift," it must imply that it is an especial favour of God to those to whom it is given.

"Although[n] it were not only better for the estimation of Priests, and other Ministers in the Church of God, to live chaste, sole, and separate from the company of women and the bond of marriage, but also thereby they might the better attend to the administration of the Gospel, and be less intricated and troubled with the charge of household, being free and unburdened from the care and cost of finding wife and children, and that it were most to be wished, that they would willingly and of themselves endeavour themselves to a perpetual chastity and abstinence from the use of women."

In the Lord's vineyard, however, there is ample room for those of both classes; our Universities still furnish an instance before our eyes, of institutions requiring a temporary celibate, and that during the most trying period of life, and often for the greater part of its probable term: and, as this shews that it is not foreign to the genius of our Church, so the conviction is continually growing, that if the degraded masses condensed in our overgrown towns, inaccessible to any means now existing, festering within themselves, yet shunning every thing unlike themselves, may yet be reclaimed, it will be, when God raises up among us men of self-denying habits, who, under the direction of our Bishops, shall gather round them others like-minded, and form

[n] Stat. An. 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 21.

corresponding institutions for those who have "forsaken all" to "follow" their Lord, to seek out His scattered sheep even in these appalling wildernesses, and preach repentance from dead works, Judgment to come, and the vanity of this fleeting world, having themselves, like the self-denying Baptist, visibly no portion in it.

It is, again, felt continually more, that besides the domestic charities so lovelily set forth by the daughters of our land, there is room for institutions, in which such as have no sacred duties at home, may devote their whole lives to visit their Lord in His sick, poor, imprisoned, naked, hungry, thirsty members[n]. Such institutions do shed a lustre upon any

[n] Since the above was written, the following remarkable confirmation has occurred in a Preface written to controvert what the Author supposes to be the peculiar views of Mr. Newman and his friends. Amid grave difference of opinion, the tone of the whole Preface seems to betoken a drawing together of men's minds, even when they must still oppose each other, and deprecate any extension of that which is peculiar to the other. The whole passage is very illustrative of what Mr. Newman has said of the moving "of the religious mind of our Church to something better and truer than satisfied the last century."

"No wise man doubts that the Reformation was imperfect, or that in the Romish system there were many good institutions, and practices, and feelings, which it would be most desirable to restore amongst ourselves. Daily church services, frequent communions, memorials of our Christian calling continually presented to our notice, in crosses and way-side oratories; commemorations of holy men, of all times and countries, the doctrine of the communion of saints practically taught, religious orders, especially of women, of different kinds, and under different rules, delivered only from the snare and sin of perpetual vows; all these, most of

Church; they are evidences of self-denying holiness fostered within it; the "sœurs de la charite" not only create a rightful sympathy towards the Churches wherein they exist, but they are one of the most powerful attractions to withdraw feeling but undisciplined minds from the communion of our own; they would be a grace to us, if we had them; the lack of them exposes us to loss. On this account alone, then, people should beware how they lightly speak against the celibate as a whole. Yet probably the objection arises from confusing *compulsory* with voluntary celibacy; the high feelings of devotedness which would with joy realize such a calling do exist among us; and it need, I think, but be known that there are (as there are) means provided for exercising such a calling under protection, and we too shall have our "sisters of charity." Parents willingly part with a daughter for an earthly bridal; some will be

which are of some efficacy for good, even in a corrupt church, belong no less to the true Church, and would be purely beneficial." (Preface to Dr. Arnold's Sermons on the Christian Life, p. lvi. v.)

There is no need of "perpetual vows;" in France vows are allowed by the State to be taken only for five years; any vow should, of course, be taken with much humility and circumspection, and after trial and acquired knowledge of a person's own strength and weakness; only it does not appear why, when "perpetual vows" are permitted and encouraged in the Old Testament, and that even by parents in behalf of their children, (as in the case of Samuel, not to speak of Samson,) they should, under the New, in which greater strength is given, be accounted as necessarily "a sin."

found to spare them to be "brides of Christ," ministers to Him in His sick.

On the other hand, *our* Reformation stands clear from that sad and inexplicable act of foreign Reformers, (which Romanists so willingly impute to all[o],) when they deliberately sanctioned a Prince's polygamy[p] as a remedy against a grosser adultery: our Reformers were bound by no vows to celibacy[q], so that Cranmer who married, broke none; others voluntarily abstained from that, which they wished to be left free to each, as they should "judge the same to serve better to godliness," thereby shewing that they advocated its legality, not as a skreen for themselves, but as thinking *compulsory* celibacy inexpedient and dangerous. In our Church no nun[r] was tempted to break her vows.

On this whole subject, it were well if before people allow themselves to use or to listen to the hard speeches which have of late years been uttered against the notion of celibacy as a religious act, or the view of it in the Ancient Church, they would consider how they escape therein speaking against their Lord. Certainly, the principle of religious celi-

[o] e. g. Dr. Butler, Lect. 5. p. 250. 267.

[p] The dispensation given by Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, and four others, to the Landgrave of Hesse, to marry a second wife, in the lifetime of the first.

[q] "The vow of chastity, which existed in the Ordination-service of the foreign Churches, formed no part of that used in England." Short, Hist. of Eng. Ch. §. 311.

[r] Dr. Butler, l. c. p. 267. Exactly the same things were brought forward before him by Dr. Milner, End of Controversy.

bacy is so plainly set down by Himself, that it seems to imply a strange ignorance or sad neglect of His word, to dare to call that principle in question. And His word is not like S. Paul's limited, by "the present distress [a]," but, like Himself, eternal. Our Church, as I said, recognises that principle in her Marriage Service. I will now but set down those His words, and, with Thorndike's [b] comment on them, so leave the subject.

"Matt. xix. 11, 12. All are not capable of this word (of not marrying). 'For there are eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are eunuchs which were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs that have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven. He that is capable let him hold this.' Here it is said that God hath made some men of such constitution of nature, that they are able to contain themselves from marriage, and that this is the gift of continence, which whoso hath, falls under a command of not marrying; whoso hath not, of marrying. But when our Lord exhorts those that are able to contain themselves from marriage to strive for that grace, certainly He makes not that a gift of nature, which He would have a man endeavour to attain. He that is exhorted to make himself an eunuch is not so made by God, but from God he hath the grace to prefer the kingdom of Heaven before even that content which God alloweth him here; and if he betray not that grace, by preferring that content before the clearest and securest means of attaining it, he will not fail of grace to perform that which he resolves for God's sake. And truly it were strange that the Gospel should make that grace which

[a] 1 Cor. vii.

[b] Epilogue, p. ii. c. 33. p. 296.

conducts to the height of Christianity, to consist in an endowment of nature."

Article xxxvii.

"The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England."

I only set this Article down, that I may not seem to omit any thing, yet there is no question to be raised upon it. It relates to temporals, not to spirituals. The "jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome" stands contrasted with "the chief power of the King's Majesty," and this is, in the Article itself, limited to things temporal. The Article is entitled, "Of the Civil Magistrates." It begins by claiming the "chief power or government of all estates of this realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes" to the "King's Majesty," and denies that it "ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction." It then explains the "chief Government" claimed for the King, negatively, not to be "the ministering either of God's word or of the Sacraments," and positively to be only, "that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers." Accordingly, its chief object is to deny the right of appeal to Rome in the case of ecclesiastical persons or causes. Then it subjoins the words prefixed above. Clearly, then, from the

whole tenor of the Article, the "jurisdiction" denied is a "temporal jurisdiction as to spiritual causes or persons." And this is illustrated by the oath of supremacy. "No foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority within this realm." Both deny to the Bishop of Rome, what and what only they claim to the King. The oath of supremacy is a negative oath of allegiance. It rejects all allegiance which may interfere with the allegiance to the King. The very terms of the oath of supremacy, (in that it puts together "prelate, state, potentate,") imply that what it contemplates is any such "jurisdiction," as shall interfere with the authority of the sovereign. Thus Archbishop Bramhall[r];

"Whatsoever power our Laws did divest the Pope of, they invested the King with it: but they never invested the King with any Spiritual power or jurisdiction; witness the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth; witness the public Articles of the Church; witness the professions of King James; witness all our Statutes themselves, wherein all the parts of Papal power are enumerated which are taken away; his Encroachments, his Usurpations, his Oaths, his Collations, Provisions, Pensions, Tenths, First-fruits, Reservations, Palls, Unions Commendam, Exemptions, Dispensations of all kinds, Confirmations, Licenses, Faculties, Suspensions, Appeals, and God knoweth how many pecuniary artifices more: but of them all, there is not

[r] Schism guarded, sect. i. c. 9. Works, p. 349. referred to in Palmer on the Church, p. ii. c. 2.

one that concerneth Jurisdiction purely Spiritual, or which is an Essential right of the power of the Keys; they are all Branches of the External Regiment of the Church, the greater part of them usurped from the Crown, sundry of them from the Bishops, and some found out by the Popes themselves, as the payment for Palls, which was nothing in St. Gregory's time, but a free gift or liberality or bounty, free from imposition and exaction.

" Lastly, consider the grounds of all our grievances expressed frequently in our Laws, and in other writers, the disinheriting of the Prince and Peers, the destruction and annullation of the Laws and the prerogative Royal, the vexation of the King's Liege People, the impoverishing of the Subjects, the draining the Kingdom of its Treasure, the decay of Hospitality, the disservice of God, and filling the Churches of England with Foreigners, the excluding Temporal Kings and Princes out of their Dominions, the Subjecting of the Realm to spoil and ravine, gross Simoniacal Contracts, Sacrilege, grievous and intolerable oppressions and extortions. Jurisdiction purely Spiritual doth neither disinherit the Prince nor the Peers, nor destroy and annul the Laws and Prerogative Royal, nor vex the King's Liege People, nor impoverish the Subject, nor drain the Kingdom of its Treasures, nor fill the Churches with Foreigners, nor exclude Temporal Kings out of their Dominions, nor subject the Realm to spoil and ravine. Authority purely Spiritual is not guilty of the Decay of Hospitality or disservice of Almighty God, or Simony, or Sacrilege, or oppressions and extortions. No, no, it is the external Regiment of the Church, by new Roman Laws and Mandates, by new Roman Sentences and Judgments, by new Roman Pardons and Dispensations, by new Roman Synods and Oaths of Fidelity, by new Roman Bishops and Clerks. It is your new Roman Tenths and First-fruits and Provisions and Reservations and Pardons and Indulgences, and the rest of those horrible mischiefs

and damnable customs, that are apparently guilty of all these evils. These Papal Innovations we have taken away indeed, and deservedly, having shewed the express time, and place, and person, when and where, and by whom every one of them was first introduced into England.

And again[x],

"We have only cast out seven or eight branches of Papal jurisdiction in the exterior court; which Christ or His Apostles never challenged, never exercised, never meddled with; which the Church never granted, never disposed. He might still for us enjoy his Protopatriarchate, and the dignity of an Apostolical Bishop, and his primacy of order, so long as the Church thought fit to continue it to that See, if this would content him."

Or again, to take the words of a recent author, following Abp. Bramhall[y].

"The learned primate Bramhall has observed, that these acts were not intended to deprive the Roman Pontiff of any really spiritual power; they only cast out some branches of his exterior jurisdiction which were not instituted by Christ, nor by the Catholic Church. They did not deny the precedency of the Bishop of Rome in the Universal Church, nor his right (in conjunction with Christian princes) of summoning and presiding in General Councils, nor his power of defining questions of faith in conjunction with the Catholic Church, nor his right to exhort all Bishops to observe the Canons, nor his being the centre of Catholic unity, when he is in communion with all the Catholic Church. None of these things (the chief privileges of the Roman primacy according to Romanists)

[x] ib. sect. 5.

[y] Palmer, l. c.

were affected by the Acts of Parliament for abolishing the usurped jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop in England; and therefore it is vain to impute schism or heresy to the Church of England on this account, even on the supposition that the primacy of the Roman See is of divine institution."

I do not mean, of course, to imply by this, that the Bishop of Rome has any lawful claims to "spiritual supremacy" over us; our very acknowledgment of our Articles implies our sense of a right committed to us, to regulate the affairs of our Church (whenever this should be necessary) by and for ourselves. I only mean, as a matter of fact, that any discussions as to any spiritual authority of the Bishop of Rome,—supposing that he was in communion with the whole Church, or that he would acknowledge its authority to be superior to his own,—is foreign to this Article, which relates to things temporal only. Meanwhile, it may be said that a primacy of order, and the claim that no Council should be considered Œcumenical and authoritative which lacked the concurrence of so eminent a See, as they will abundantly satisfy both the concessions of any of the early fathers, and the claims of the earlier Popes, so may they be obviously conceded without any risk to the safety of our Provincial Church.

On the same ground, lest I should appear to gloss over any thing, I would just advert to three other

Articles not relating to questions in which we are at issue with the Romish system, and apparently not contemplated by those, who condemned the principles of the Tract. So much has been written on them lately, that I may be the more brief here.

Article xi.

"That we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine."

On Article xi. our friend contends, that "Justification by faith only," as the instrument through which we receive it, does not exclude "Baptism" from being the instrument through which God conveys it; and this is indeed so palpable from the Article itself, which is contrasting only "the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," received "through faith," with "our own works or deservings," that it seems strange how any should have thought that the doctrine of Baptism entered at all into the subject of this Article. The Article simply contrasts "the merits of our Lord and Saviour" and "our works," and says we are justified for the sake of the one, not of the other; it is employed in laying down one principle, not in stating the whole compass of divinity; the doctrine of the Sacraments comes in elsewhere; the Article contrasts, as the source or meritorious

causes of Justification, "the Merits of our Lord" and "our own merits;" and these would naturally exclude each other; but "our Lord's merit" as the "sole *source* of our justification" does not exclude "Baptism" as the "sole channel" through which He conveys it, any more than it does faith as the sole instrument through which we receive it. The whole is concisely worded thus[a];

"We are justified by Christ alone, in that He has purchased the gift; by Faith alone, in that Faith asks for it; by Baptism alone, for Baptism conveys it; and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it."

Articles xii. and xiii.

"Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit ['before justification,' title of the Article] are not pleasant to God (minimè Deo grata sunt) forasmuch as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make man meet to receive grace, or (as the School authors say) deserve grace of congruity (merentur gratiam de congruo); yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin. Albeit good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification (justificatos sequuntur), cannot put away (expiare) our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable (grata et accepta) to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith."

As, in Article xi. "the merits of our Lord" are

[a] Tract 90, p. 13.

contrasted with "our own," so in Articles xii. and xiii. our own works before and after justification are broadly contrasted with each other; and one chief object of the two Articles plainly is, to carry out the contrast of Article xi., and to declare that our works are no ways the meritorious cause of our acceptableness with God;—not those before justification, because "they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done," and so "have the nature of sin;" nor those after, because 1) they "cannot put away our sins," nor 2) even in themselves "endure the severity of God's judgment;"—and therefore we must on both grounds have recourse to the merits of our Lord to efface our sins, and obtain a merciful judgment for our good works. We are, then, thus contemplated in these Articles, as in two conditions, "justified" and "unjustified," and our works are declared broadly and on the whole, in our unjustified state to have "the nature of sin;" good works, in our justified state, are said to be "pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ." But although, to use our friend's strong words in another place[b], of our state by nature,

"all that we do, whether from better principles or from worse, whether of an indifferent nature or directly moral, whether spontaneously, or habitually, or accidentally, all is pervaded with a quality of evil so odious to

[b] On Justification, p. 97.

Almighty God, as to convert even our best services into profanations; or, in the expressive words of St. Paul, 'They that are in the flesh cannot please God;'"

it does not follow, of course, that all works "before justification" have equally "the nature of sin." Each of these states,—justification, or being unjustified,—admits of infinite variations and degrees, from theirs who are all but angels to theirs who are all but devils. As being justified or no, they may be considered as two states; but the individuals included under them may be in an infinite variety of relations to Almighty God. Taken as two states, the "justified" must include all, from those who have all but attained to perfection, to those in whom "the things which remain" "are ready to die," and themselves are all but out of their justified state: on the other hand, of those not justified, some may be almost Christians, others "past feeling," or without any trace of the life of God in them or of His image. But since there can be no good thing in any one, except through the Spirit of God and the grace of Christ, they who are "almost Christians" can not have become such except through His grace and inspiration; they are being "drawn by the Father" and so are in some way acceptable to Him, although, in that they are *being* drawn, and not actually "come" to the Son, they are not yet justified: still they and their actions are in an intermediate state; they are not justified, nor their good actions like the "good works" of the jus-

tified; and yet neither are they nor their actions like those whose heart the Holy Spirit has not moved nor influenced their actions. Cornelius was in a degree "accepted with God;" his "righteousness, worked" through the Divine aid, his "prayers" and his "alms" had "gone up for a memorial before God;" still he was not yet justified; for the angel, who tells him "thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God," bade him also send for St. Peter, "who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Again, as Bishop Bull points out, since repentance and faith are required of those who come to be baptized, and repentance is not a simple feeling, but one issuing in various actions, there must be, in all cases, before justification, actions in their degree accepted by God, yet accepted not as man's own, but His, Whose gift repentance and the works of repentance are. To hear Bishop Bull[c]:

"Proceed we to the second class of testimonies, those namely in which some special works are prescribed as altogether necessary to salvation. Hereto belong passages which require repentance, as an antecedent condition, without which no one obtains forgiveness of sins from God. Such occur every where in the New Testament; to take then one or two only; Acts ii. 38. 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;' and Acts iv. 19. 'Repent therefore,

[c] Harm. Apost. c. 2. §. 6, 7.

and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the Presence of the Lord.' In these places, any one must see that besides faith, repentance from sin also, and turning to God, are required of necessity for the remission of sins or justification."

"It is further to be observed, that repentance is not one or a single work, but the complex, as it were, of many other works. For it comprehends within its compass the following works, which are neither few nor of slight account. 1) Sorrow for sins, (2 Cor. vii. 10.) 2) Humiliation under the hand of God, whereby a person humbly acknowledges that he deserves the Divine wrath, (Jas. iv. 10.) 3) Hatred and detestation of sins, (Ezek. vi. 9. xx. 43. xxxvi. 31.) 4) Confession of sins, (1 Joh. i. 9.) 5) Earnest and lowly entreaty of the Divine mercy, (Acts viii. 2.) 6) The love of God, (Ex. xx. 6.) 7) Ceasing from sin, (Prov. xxviii. 13. Is. i. 16.) 8) A firm purpose of new obedience, (Acts xi. 23.) 9) Restitution of things ill-gotten, (Ex. xxxiii. 14, 15. Lev. vi. 1—7. Luke xix. 8, 9.)—10) Forgiveness of things which our neighbours have committed against us,—(Matt. vi. 14, 15.) 11) Works of mercy or alms. Which how much they avail to obtain remission of sins from God, is sufficiently clear from that well-known passage, Dan. iv. 27. where the holy prophet suggests this wholesome counsel to king Nebuchadnezzar, as yet sticking fast in his sins, 'Redeem thy sins by almsgiving and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor.'—Herewith agreeth in the New Testament what St. James teacheth in this same 2d chapter, v. 13. 'Judgment without mercy to him, who hath shewed no mercy.' But what 'mercy' he means, is clear from what follows, v. 15, 16. See Luke xi. 41. (and Grotius on the place, Is. i. 17. Luke xvi. 9. 1 Tim. vi. 17, &c. 1 Pet. iv. 8. Heb. xiii. 16. so that Chrysostome truly said (in the Sermon on repentance), 'Repentance without almsgiving

is dead and hath no wings.' And hence (to note this by the way) arose that practice observed in the ancient Church, whereby, of such as through very grave offences had fallen under the censure of the Church, there was required, to make them capable of absolution, not only confession of sins and amendment of their past life, but also works of mercy, by them called ἀγαθοεργίαι, good works. You see how widely works of repentance extend; you see that they are all laid down by the Holy Spirit as altogether necessary to obtain forgiveness of sins."

Since, then, repentance is a work or, as Bp. Bull says, "a complex of good works," and yet antecedent to justification, it follows that there are works, in their degree acceptable to God, by Whose aid and the inspiration of Whose good Spirit they are wrought, antecedent to a man's complete justification; whereas Bp. Bull's opponent, that he might escape admitting that works had any connection with justification, consistently maintained, that "repentance or true contrition for sin, was no ways necessary to obtain the first justification." Bp. Bull, in support of his doctrine, appeals to the Homilies, our Liturgy, and Catechism, that repentance (including the fruits of repentance), as well as faith, is requisite to justification; and Field[n], whom he quotes, declares in the name of the Protestants generally;

"They teach no such thing [as they were charged with by Stapleton, 'that they make our justification to consist in the sole remission of sins by faith, that the sacraments

confer nothing to our justification]' but that Baptism and repentance are necessarily required in them that are to be first justified."[m]

It is clear, then, that the object of our Articles was, to secure broadly the great principles, that we are accounted righteous before God, for the merits of our Redeemer, received through faith, not for our own; that even when justified, our works, through the remains of corruption in us, cannot be the grounds of our final acceptance, as neither were those before justification, of our justification; in few words, that we were chosen beforehand, of God's free grace, not on account of any thing in us, to be made members of His Son; and when in Him, are finally accepted, for His sake, in Whom we are. The doctrine, which it would exclude by Art. xiii., is a form of Pelagianism, that the works in themselves "make men meet to receive grace," that God chooses men to the privileges of the Gospel with regard to what they, by their natural powers, became: the statement, of course, does not mean to exclude the truth, that "grace used attracts more grace;" that "to him that hath, shall be given;" that obedience to God's fainter and indistincter calls is rewarded by Him by clearer and distincter, until "whom He hath called, them He also justifieth."[n]

[m] Dr. Th. Tull quoted in the Apol. pro Harm. sect. 7. §. 2.

[n] App. to B. 3. on the Church, p. 298.

Our friend's words then seem to me fully borne out;

"They[o] [the Articles] say that works before grace and justification are worthless and worse, and that works after grace and justification are acceptable, but they do not speak at all of works with God's aid before justification."

I have now gone through the several Articles, of which explanations were given in our friend's Tract; I examined these explanations carefully, with a view to ascertain whether they did contain any relaxation of the Articles (as I myself understood them) or no; had it appeared to me so, there was yet the further question, to what extent the Articles were meant to include persons, who did not go so far from doctrine existing in the Church of Rome as their Authors; it is certain from Bp. Burnet's statement, quoted by our friend[p], that this was the object of a change in the 28th Article, when the 39 Articles were, in Q. Elizabeth's reign, formed out of the 42; to me, however, there seemed no occasion to go to this point; I have felt no doubt, carefully and conscientiously examining both editions of the Tract, that the meaning in which our friend would have them construed, in conformity and subordination to the teaching of the Church Catholic, is not only *an* admissible, but *the* most legitimate, inter-

[o] Tract 90, p. 81. [p] Tract 90, p. 82.

pretation of them; it appears to me as clear, that they are not directed against any thing occurring, here and there, in the early Church, even though not Catholic, but against the existing system in the Church of Rome. This appears to me so plain, that I cannot but think that any who persist in those imputations of "jesuitism, dishonesty, &c." must be actuated by some "spirit, they know not of." Nor need I conceal my deep regret, that a body, for whom we both feel much respect and regard, should, in this instance, have departed from its wonted caution and tenderness of proceeding, and condemned precipitately, unexplained and unheard, the principles of the Tract, which, so suddenly brought before them, they but imperfectly understood. On a former occasion when you were away from us, they suspended, for a whole Term, the proposed condemnation of a publication, in order to give time for the Author to explain his views, and for that explanation to be weighed; on the present, they thought it better not to wait even two days. They admitted that they had no precedent upon which to proceed; but they preferred, in all this haste, to establish a new one. I do not mean to impute any personal unkindness to them; quite the contrary; some of them (deceiving themselves, I must think) thought that they were doing what was kindest towards our friend, by precipitating the condemnation of the Tract, while he was yet induced by the wishes

of friends to withhold his name; I only mean to express what is generally felt, that they acted under panic and excitement, produced by misconception and misrepresentation. They could not, I think, have judged as they did, had they allowed the first alarm and excitement to pass by, had they heard (as they were requested from more than one quarter, and from one which they ought most to have regarded) the explanation which was all but on the point of being laid before them, and "given the accused license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him." It is grievous certainly that the Heads of Houses should, on so imperfect a view of the case, have encouraged by their authority, all the imputations of dishonesty so freely cast upon us, because we understand our Church and her system in a way different from one, of late popular among persons, who, we must think, have very little studied either her, her character, or her formularies. Not less embarrassing is the very vagueness and comprehensiveness of their condemnation; "interpretations, such as are suggested in the Tract;"—*all* such are condemned; yet what they are, is left for each to gather for himself as best he may; one will claim the authority of the Board[b] for one thing, one for another,

[b] Even such a writer as Dr. Miller, gives circulation to the report, that the "Board of the University" had "actually instituted the appeal [to the Church] which he [Dr. M.] had resolved to prefer, in the transmission of a most obnoxious Tract

as each may be disposed; while I myself, and those who look on the Tract as I do, can only think that they condemned "modes of interpretation," which they inferred to be contained in it, but which never had any real existence. I should be sorry needlessly to say any thing which might pain a body, whom I much value, and from whom I hope much; yet I cannot but think that they have put themselves in a false position, condemning unheard the Tract of one, over whom they had no authority, and that in terms so vague as readily to admit of being stretched to what I am convinced they did not intend, the "mode of interpretation" really contemplated in the Tract, the Catholic interpretation of the Articles and the Catholic scheme of doctrine. I may as well speak out what is commonly felt; I cannot but think that, along with any anxiety about the danger of "modes of interpretation" of the Tract, which I have ground to think had been inculcated very earnestly upon them, they were under an unconscious bias, that they wished to relieve the University of the onus of the Tracts, as much as to condemn any "modes of interpretation;" and that the preamble "the

of which Mr. N. had acknowledged himself the writer, to the several Bishops of the English Church." (Letter to Prof. Sewell, Irish Eccl. Journ. No. 10.) A private individual did send the Tract, on his own responsibility, to the Bishops of England and Ireland, and this is made the act of the Board of Heads of Houses, and that Board the "Board of the University."

Tracts for the Times, a series of anonymous publications purporting to be written by Members of the University, *but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself*," was as important in their eyes, as the resolution which it ushered in. Certainly, unless this had been a prominent object with them, there was no occasion for so designating the Tracts at all, and it is difficult to imagine in what way the University could have been supposed to have " sanctioned" Tracts, over which it had no control, which were not even printed within it, did not bear its " Imprimatur," did not any way fall under its statutes or its cognizance. On the other hand, while they condemned this Tract on the ground of a statute, enjoining " that every student shall be instructed and examined in the 39 Articles and shall subscribe to them;" they left uncondemned a " History of Christianity" by one also a member and once a Professor in the University, which in a very distressing way explains away miracles of our Blessed Lord; and yet, that same statute enjoins, that every student be instructed and examined in the " *Evidences of religion:*" they had recently listened very patiently to a sermon denying Baptismal regeneration. I do not question their right to disconnect the University from the Tracts in question, although it was done rather by a side-wind; we never sought to compromise the University, nor to gain its sanction; we are but what we are, private individuals in it, formed by her teach-

ing, by the spirit which she breathes, by the moral tone which her discipline imparts; her sons, and the sons of those who transmitted these doctrines to us. But now that they have formally disclaimed "any way sanctioning the Tracts" and have relieved the University of this odium, and disembarrassed her defence by her "friends without," I own I think it would be but befitting their candour, to reconsider the whole subject, qualify (if on mature thought they see occasion) the sentence which they lately passed, and state more definitely what they object to, what they do not. This they are called upon to do by others[c], in an opposite direction, and to make their condemnation more stringent. I fear nothing from the real expression of their opinion, such as it would now be formed, after the interval of peace and calm which the Holy Season, lately past, brought with it.

I would now, only, in conclusion, say a few words on two subjects incidentally connected with the Tract;—the acknowledged tendency of certain individuals in our Church to Romanism, and the position of our own Church.

[c] The Edinburgh Review, No. 147, p. 293. which very consistently urges as a ground, that on the supposed principles of Tract 90, Dissenters would be admissible to the University; which, of course, it must much deprecate!

Of the extent of the tendency to Romanism, which our friend acknowledges to exist in detached cases, I have no means of forming any estimate; but, whatever it be, it is surely a very short-sighted view to make the Tracts or their authors responsible for it. Was not the Church warned sixteen years ago, (when we were being taught, not teaching,) by that teacher whose memory we together cherish and revere, "with very solemn seriousness," to "buckle on her armour and prepare herself to defend her very citadel and the palladium of her faith?" Were there no secessions to Romanism before the Tracts began? none, and not rather in large numbers, and those wholly persons whose Church-views were most opposed to our's? In Edinburgh alone, the annual converts to Romanism were calculated at 100; but from the Kirk, not from our Church. No! Rome has many sympathies whereby to draw persons to herself. To those who would lean, she offers undoubting guidance; for those who would have certainty, she offers infallibility; for the devout, she has her Churches ever open and her frequent public services, her retreats for devotion and contemplation; for the affectionate, she has the memory of the saints of old; for the imaginative, she has a nominal reverence for Antiquity and a visible Unity of Communion, spread over the whole

[a] British Critic, No. 1. 1825.

world, and every where professing to teach the same truth. Her theory of Unity (to speak of this first) at once fills the imagination and contents the intellect. It is indeed a saltus mortalis; but those who can shut their eyes and take it, it places beyond further difficulty. The visible unity of the Church falls short of what it should be and what we should have hoped; Rome cuts the knot by maintaining that her one Communion is the one Church. Her's is indeed a fearful theory, cutting off at one stroke 90 millions of the Greek Orthodox Church, as well as our own Communion. Yet, if any shrink not from this, or know not that there is a Church as large almost as that of Rome, which she cuts off from the Church "out of which there is no salvation," in order to make way for her scheme, it is a simple theory: it removes all the difficulties which these sad and long rents of the Church present to other theories of her Unity, to say boldly with Rome, that the Church is visibly one still; that intercommunion is essential to the one visible Church; that Rome and Churches not in communion with her cannot form one Church; that the Churches in communion with Rome, as being the majority of Christendom, are the Church; and that therefore Churches, not in communion with her, are no Churches. In this way, any strong statement of the claims and the unity of the Church may be made a ground for joining the Romish communion, and I myself know a

case, in which this effect was produced by some tracts of the Christian Knowledge Society.

Again, to take another class of minds, long residence at Rome, now so common with our countrymen, cannot be a thing indifferent; what is Catholic and un-Catholic is so strangely blended together in the Roman system, that if what is un-Catholic repels not, what is Catholic must win; the German artists have continually been drawn to her through their studies; among our own people, it is well known that the associations with the bright early days of the Faith, with Apostles and Martyrs, the richness of her worship, her solemn and primitive music, her paintings, her ceremonies, have again and again created a sympathy with her whole system, evil as well as good; it is idle then for persons to bring their families within the sphere of all which is fascinating to the senses in the Romish system, to take them to the ceremonies, with which, unless very well regulated or else profane, they will unduly sympathize, and then attribute to any publications in England the tendency to Romanism. Persons who had returned to this country, with a strong bias towards Rome, have been recovered by our teaching; their bias came not from us, but from the thoughtlessness which familiarized them with its mingled beauties and corruptions.

Again, another class is predisposed to Rome by the harsh language used towards her, and by

careless imputations, which they discover to be unfounded[w]: another by the conflicting opinions among ourselves, which it sees to be unnatural and a defect in the state of a Church, and which it hopes to escape by giving itself up implicitly to one, who undertakes to guide it[x]. Another is attracted by her order and discipline; another by the self-devotion of some of her members[y]; another by finding in her, amid her corruptions, (which in this country are removed from sight,) Catholic truths and practices which they have never been taught to see, where they are, in their own Church. These hear, for the first time, in her, of the high doctrine of the

[w] "I can say for myself, and I think every one who advances from Protestantism towards Catholicity can say with me, that as light breaks upon our minds we do not doubt of Rome, our doubts lie the other way; for we say Rome is right so far; we have been deceived; and being wrong in these points, there is reason to fear that we are wrong in others We doubt Protestantism as a whole, and suspect that Rome is right." "Rev. Mr. Mason, a distinguished convert," quoted in Rev. J. Rathborne's [a Romanist] Letter on the Oxford Movement, p. 18. A person's bias ought to be to trust the Communion in which he was made a member of Christ; but this writer, discovering himself to have been in error in some points as to another Communion, mistrusted his Church, and trusted Rome. In like way, the only person who went over to Rome, professing previously to have valued some of our writings, went over in about three weeks; setting aside all other circumstances, what must be thought of that person's sense of responsibility, who, in three weeks after his first impression in favour of a foreign Communion, could decide on forsaking that in which God had placed him?

[x] e. g. the authoress of the two first vols. of Geraldine.

[y] The sight of the sœurs de la charité has had this effect.

Holy Eucharist, while that of Transubstantiation is glossed over; and they think that in her alone, is the Holy Eucharist more than a sign or commemoration. They witness, in her, weekly fastings or daily prayers, and know not that their own Church enjoins the one, and provides the other; that the negligence of the laity in coming, alone hinders the daily service being realized as our Church desires. They hear, in her, that almsdeeds are good for the soul, and have not been taught the comforts of almsgiving, which our Communion Service sets forth in the words of Holy Scripture, and our Homilies from its teaching, in connection with the fathers. They hear of the value of habitual confession of sins before God's ministers, as a means of self-discipline, and of the benefits of Absolution, and know not that our Church suggests it for such as need it, and leaves them at liberty to choose for their Confessor whom they will[z]. In these and in other ways, it has continually happened that persons have sought in the Communion of Rome, what was laid up for them in their own, more fully and without corruption, had they but known it; and this valuable class will, of course, be the more secured from wandering, the more the high Catholic

[z] "Let him come unto me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word, he may receive the benefit of absolution," &c. First Exhort. in Communion Service.

doctrines of our Church are developed, and her principles acted on. Instances have recently occurred, in which by these means persons, for many years estranged from her communion, have been restored to it from that of Rome which they had joined. Again, the more people cast themselves back into Antiquity, and sympathize with the Fathers and the Saints of old, and feel themselves one Church with the Church of primitive times, the more will that painful void be filled up, which is caused by her present state of isolation. We have a communion of Saints, a fellowship of doctrine, a oneness by descent, with the Church in Apostolic days, even if those who are now in the flesh acknowledge us not.

The character also in which Rome exhibits herself in England, much aggravates our present difficulties; her policy is a corruption of the Apostolic wisdom, to "become all things to all, that by all means, it may" gain some; "it falleth down and humbleth itself, that the congregations of the poor may fall into the hands of its strong ones." Her principle, that there is no salvation out of Communion with herself, makes it her first object to draw people any how into her Communion. The extent too of her Communion is the tangible proof she puts forward of her being *the* Catholic Church. This is a sore temptation to her to bend, relax, fall in with unholy ways and usages, which promote this her first end. She would

further holiness as much as she can; but she cannot afford to do what is right, if it would cause the unholy to part from her. She is obliged to temporize, to lure, to condescend, when she cannot control. In some countries, she is suffering the penalty of former sins, having to support the credit of false miracles, which she cannot disavow, without owning the past to have been a fraud; while in all, over which she has dominion, she will tolerate and profit by what she dares not approve; will sit by in silence while men tell falsehood or use violence in her behalf; will suffer visions and miracles which she does not believe, to be believed by her people and to bring gain to her clergy; and even in her own guarded province of the faith will permit unauthorized doctrines (such as that of the immaculate Conception) to creep in and take the public honours of truth [h], wherever men are disposed to receive them. It is painful to think and speak of these things in another member of the mystical Body of Christ, who once was the bulwark of the Faith and a pattern of zeal, and who still has holy practices and institutions, which we might gladly imitate; but Rome forces it upon us by sending amongst us to steal away the hearts of the children of our Church, boldly denying whatever corruptions our people have not before their eyes; since these things were swept away by the Reformation, and she has been able to begin anew

[h] Festivals and Churches in honour of it.

in a spirit more congenial to that of religious minds here, and more approximating to early Christianity. Thus for the more "enthusiastic feelings of foreign hearts[i]," where the presence of a Reformed Church furnishes no check, she has wonder-working images of the Blessed Virgin curiously decked out, through the offerings of those taught to seek relief from them[k]; rival images, which for some time contended for superiority through the cures which they were alleged to perform, until at last popular favour having turned towards the one[l], it receives all the offerings, the other remains neglected and in disgrace; pictures of saints which are said, by being carried

[i] Dr. Wiseman, Letter to Mr. Newman, p. 25. These feelings, I am assured, meet with but partial sympathy, and sometimes with wonder and doubt, amongst Romanists of our own country who are sojourners abroad.

[k] It is but following the example of Dr. Wiseman (p. 26.) to give the following recent dialogue between an earnest-minded English Catholic traveller and the person who shewed the Church; "In a Church at Venice (I am as sure as I can be it was the del Camine) I saw a Madonna gorgeously dressed, and asked why it was so unusually decorated. The Sagrestano said, It was 'a very rich Madonna,' and that the people brought every year great offerings of oil, wax, and money. I asked why? He said, 'it had done many miracles.' I said, 'I know God could do miracles, but did not understand how an image should do miracles.' He said, 'The Madonna prays for us in Heaven.' I said, 'Supposing that to be so, I see no connection between her intercession, and this image of wood and silk.' He said, 'The faith teaches us so.'"

[l] That in the Augustinian Church, in Rome; the other is in the Pantheon.

in procession, to have stopped the plague and to have averted the Cholera; at Rome, the image of a "Holy Child" is brought forth to bless the people, and much benefit looked for by the populace from its blessing and the honour paid to it[m]; at Naples the blood of S. Januarius is still yearly liquefied[n], and the people are encouraged to look upon the imposture as the sign of the favour of the Almighty[o]; in another Church is a waxen figure of our Lord as an infant, to which the king and the Court make an annual procession at Christmas, the king carrying scissors to cut the hair of the image, which, it is asserted, grows miraculously every year[p]; at Rome is an image of the Virgin which on one day in the year nods her head

[m] It is kept in the Church of the Ara Cœli in the Capitol. Popular stories are told of its return to the Church, after it had been sent for to work a cure, and another been exchanged for it, too painfully ludicrous to set down, considering Whom the image represents.

[n] A corresponding imposture and the mode of its being wrought at Hales in Gloucestershire, is related by Bp. Burnet, Hist. Ref. b. iii. t. i. p. 441.

[o] "The scenes said often to take place on the Festival of S. Januarius almost exceed belief; if the blood liquefies quickly, all the people praise the Saint and promise him offerings; if not, they abuse him in most unmeasured terms, (some of which were repeated to me,) and threaten not to send him any more gifts, or to take any more notice of him." Statement of a traveller. It has been an habitual practice to delay the apparent liquefying of the blood and ascribe it to the presence of "heretics" (English persons).

[p] Statement of a traveller.

when she grants prayers[q]; the Church is thronged to see it; indulgences are still granted for visiting favourite shrines[r]; in Italy, the prayers which

[q] Burnet has a similar account, Hist. Ref. b. iii. t. i. p. 440, l. "For their images, some of them were brought to London, and were there, at St. Paul's Cross, in the sight of all the people, broken; that they might be fully convinced of the juggling impostures of the monks. And in particular, the crucifix of Boxley in Kent, commonly called *the rood of grace;* to which many pilgrimages had been made, because it was observed sometimes to bow, and to lift itself up; to shake, and to stir head, hands, and feet; to roll the eyes, move the lips, and bend the brows: all which were looked on by the abused multitude as the effects of a divine power. These were now publicly discovered to have been cheats: for the springs were showed, by which all these motions were made. Upon which John Hilsey, then Bishop of Rochester, made a sermon, and broke the rood in pieces." A similar story of "a wooden image of the Virgin, held in very great veneration, bowing its head in acknowledgment of salutations, and stretching forth a finger, which before was doubled," together with a miraculous voice, is gravely told in a short "treatise on the most famous confraternity of the Scapular." Dublin.

[r] The following copies of Indulgences are furnished by the traveller alluded to, note k.

1. In the Church of S. Cosmo e Damiano in the Forum at Rome.

Indulgence.

"The image (picture) of the most holy Mary which is at the great altar spoke to the Pope St. Gregory, and said to him, 'Why dost thou not salute me in passing as thou wert wont?' The Saint asked pardon, and granted to those that should celebrate mass at that altar, the liberation of a soul from Purgatory, that is, of that soul for which the mass is celebrated."

2. In the Church of S. Maria Sopra Minerva, Rome, under

occur in the middle of the sermon, seem often studiously directed to the Blessed Virgin; in the South of France, the Jesuits are now anew directing the devotions of the poorer people to the Blessed Virgin; in Ireland, it is taught that the wearing of the Scapular of the Virgin, which may be lined with silk, saves from Hell[q], and that on performance

the short exercise in honour of the afflicted heart of the most holy Mary.

Sacra Indulgenza.

"His Holiness our Lord Pope Pius VII. fel. req. vouchsafed to grant for ever the indulgence of 300 days, applicable to the holy souls in Purgatory, to all the faithful every time they shall recite the above prayers, according to the Rescript dated January 3, 1825."

3. Also over the entrance to the Chapel of Santa Maria della Salute.

"His Holiness our Lord Pope Gregory XVI. by a brief dated September 17, 1836, accorded a plenary indulgence to whomsoever, after confessing and communicating, shall devoutly visit this holy image of the blessed Virgin under the title of Consolatrice degli afflitti, on the second Sunday in July and its octave in every year. He conceded also the partial indulgence of 200 days to whomsoever, at least contrite, shall visit the same holy image on any day of the year. The above indulgences are moreover applicable to the good of the souls in Purgatory.

February 11, 1839.

4. In the Medici Chapel at San Lorenzo, Florence.

Paulus V. Pont. Max. cuique Sacerdoti qui ad hoc altare pro defunctis litaverit, animam *supremis pœnis* liberare perpetuo, AN. MDCX. concessit."

See further on Indulgences Mr. Palmer's First Letter to Dr. Wiseman, p. 16—19, 31, 2. 43. and above, p. 91. note k.

[q] "If our blessed Lady had bid us do some great thing, we ought to do it; how much rather then when she saith, Wear

of some easy conditions, she delivers those of the Confraternity from Purgatory on the first Saturday after their decease[r]; at Rome the month of May is annually devoted to her service and called by her name; her medal or picture is solemnly placed on the breasts of children; the declaration of her power and compassion is held, in spiritual exercises, to be efficacious, even with sinners who have listened unmoved to arguments from the justice and mercy of God; her name seems often to displace that of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity; she is still held

my livery and you shall not suffer eternal fire! If she had enjoined us to make a great abstinence; to undergo some rigorous mortification; or to undertake a long and tedious pilgrimage, with this condition, that we should be freed from eternal damnation; from the torments of purgatory, and from the many dangerous events which easily do befal us in this life; right reason would dictate to us, that we ought to attempt any thing for the obtaining of so great good: how much more then, when she had annexed these and many more extraordinary graces to the reception only, and devout wearing the holy habit of the Scapular, with a final confidence in her powerful protection; but you will, perhaps, with Naaman, object, what can such a weak thing avail us, as the Scapular is? To this I answer with the apostle, (1 Corinth. i. 27.) The weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he might confound the strong. He that made choice of the weak element of water to wash us from the original sin, which is deeply indicated in us by the prevarication of our first father Adam, hath made use of the weak habit of the Scapular to produce those excellent effects which are mentioned in the chapter following.

[r] Treatise on the Scapular, c. 9. (Dublin.)

out virtually as a preferable mediatrix to our Lord Himself[s], and popular feeling flows so directly towards adoration of her, that even Rome herself has at least on one occasion been forced to pause and has denied to her image, what it is shocking should ever have been asked for it[t],—honours hitherto reserved for those mysteries in which Rome acknowledges the presence of God incarnate. In the new school of art in Munich, on the contrary, where religion is in a purer form, the Mother, as in the oldest school[u], has again become a subordinate object, and although enthroned, is worshipping her Son. In Ireland, Romanism becomes political and is subservient to demagogues; in the United States, she boasts that she is Republican; on the continent of Europe she courts absolute sovereigns; among ourselves, she drops, as far as possible, every thing distinctive, and assimilates herself, as much as may be, to the Anglican Church; "Transubstantiation" is represented as the doctrine of the "Real Presence;" pictures of Purgatory, and Purgatorial societies have no place, and persons are allowed to believe Purgatory itself to be only the loss of the Divine

[s] See Postscript.

[t] viz. the use of the canopy in processions.

[u] In the oldest paintings, the Madonna is introduced, meditating on or praying to, or proposing for contemplation her Infant Son; in the school of Raphael, &c. she is only shewing a mother's care, and, as the mother, is the chief object.

Presence (pœna damni), not any sensible suffering (pœna sensus), and so to differ little from the doctrine of the intermediate state[x]; (while in Ireland persons are incited to religious acts in memory of The Passion of our Lord by the grant of indulgences, many plenary, others for many hundred years[y], "applicable to *suffering* souls in Purgatory.") Invocations of Saints, in which they are called upon themselves to aid us, are withdrawn, and the practice is represented as identical with requests to friends on earth[z]; Indulgences are limited

[x] One, who had gone over to Romanism, stated to the Author that he had never met with any other doctrine as to Purgatory, among Romanists, though he had spoken with very many. The pain, according to him, consisted in an intense longing for the Divine Presence; so that, instead of being a state of "greater suffering than any thing in this life," (see above, p. 84—87,) it would be a state of higher joy than is vouchsafed to most Christians, corresponding to that spoken of in the Canticles.

[y] "The pious sodality," &c. p. 30. see above, p. 92. note k. In Bouvier, the word "suffering" does not occur. Again in the treatise on the Scapular, c. 7. "The excellency and greatness of this privilege [the speedy release of the souls of the confraternity through S. Mary] will easily appear, if we consider how horrible the *broiling* torments of purgatory are; (the angelical doctor S. Thomas saith) that they do exceed the pains, which Jesus Christ suffered in His holy Passion.—From these fearful torments the devouts of the holy Scapular are exempted, &c."

[z] Dr. Wiseman admits, "Without wishing to cast censure upon any one, I have observed with pain, that occasionally in controversy regarding the Saints and their Queen, there is a temptation to lower the consideration in which we hold them,

to the remission of punishment on this earth; "images and pictures" are become again only "instruments of teaching," or reminiscences of absent friends. "These things," said Romanist ecclesiastics from our country in the presence of one of the favourite images at Rome, "seem strange to us." "They carry the worship of the Blessed Virgin and of the Saints too far here; it interferes with the worship of God." In Italy, miracles are alleged on authority, in support of doctrine, which, in this country are withdrawn[a] from the narrative, as suspicious or unbefitting. Among us, as (in the main) a

to dim their glory, and perhaps to save ourselves some reproaches, at the expense of our Catholic brethren abroad." Remarks on Mr. Palmer's Letter, end. Dr. W. perhaps does not know, as we do, that in our countrymen of his Communion, these feelings of disparagement of their brethren abroad are not assumed only in controversy, but are often seriously entertained.

[a] "I read it [the original of Liguori's "Glories of Mary," approved of by the Convocation of Rites, with the sanction of Pius VII. 1803.] most carefully, and was surprised to find that the main proofs for this unscriptural worship was a series of visions and supposed miracles said to be wrought by images, &c. almost all of them childish beyond conception, and some of them ludicrous in the extreme. On comparing the translation with the original, I found that the translator had prudently suppressed the most silly." Rev. E. Nixon, Address to the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of Castletown, 1840. The author, who writes only in self-vindication, abstains from translating these stories, because "I do not like trifling upon any religious subject, and it would be impossible to read those fables with a grave countenance."

moral earnest people, Confession is used as a check to sin; in Italy the obligation to it is made consistent with a state of society generally and openly charged with the grossest profligacy, tempting to it, and in itself almost implying the commission of "adultery in the heart;" if common opinion be but partially grounded in truth, we must believe that adulterers and adulteresses receive absolution from the Priest, and "return to their vomit" which they never purposed to quit: while in Rome which calls itself "Mater Orbis" the first Bishop of the West presides over a government chiefly composed of Ecclesiastics, and yet so corrupt that it has passed into a proverb that the sight of Rome is incompatible with faith, "Roma veduta, fede perduta." In this country, fasting is dispensed with on account of sickness only; in Spain dispensations from fasting, except on Friday, are sold, as a matter of course, to any one, or to whole families habitually, who prefer not to fast; in Rome, the very Day of our Lord's Passion (and that, during the very hours when He was nailed to the Cross for us) is uniformly, amid some outward distinctions of meats, made by Cardinals a day of official entertainment and a feast[b]. "When I go to

[b] "On Good Friday Cardinal ——— received all the Cardinals at dinner at two in the afternoon with many Englishmen in uniform. The dinner consisted of soup, fish, cutlets, and every variety of dish all made of fish, but indistinguishable

mass in my own country," said a pious German nobleman lately, "it is to pray; but here [at Rome] prayer seems the last object for which people assemble; the fashionable Churches are mere conversaziones." And while among us corruptions are withdrawn, Rome adopts studiously "evangelical" language[c]; exhibits beautiful pictures of monastic life to attract the enthusiastic among us; introduces "orders of mercy" such as we might have ourselves, which we too need, and which are most calculated to win a kind-hearted nation. In this way, she has gained some, and is too likely to gain more; whether in the end she will not have to repay with usury those whom by such means she has gained, we cannot yet see; such converts are Anglicans at heart; at least are far nearer to our Communion, than (in its present state) to that to which they have joined themselves; this, as our Church realizes her position, they may, we trust, more and more see; their sympathies are with us, not with the corruptions in the Roman Church; we have resigned them, we trust, in chastisement only, to receive them again after a while, bringing back with them, (if it may be,)

from the richness of the sauces from any other dinner. This was annual." MS. Journal.

[c] Such was the impression upon the author, on reading the 3d vol. of Geraldine; attributed to an able controversialist. The very vehicle, being unreal, (a story,) perhaps gave the more temptation to use unreal language; yet the same has been observed by another, who would "think no evil."

the rest of that estranged Communion to our ancient British Church; we may hope that it is but like the Eastern fable, that the darkness greedily swallowed the light, but was itself overcome by that which it absorbed into itself. But though we may hope this in the end, they who join the Romish Communion in this country on the ground of its purity from what is peculiarly Romish, have no security that they may not at any time be entangled in the whole system; what has been, may again be; and one may unhesitatingly say, that it is the presence of our Church alone, which makes Romanism in this country so different from what it was, and, in Italy especially, now is. Whoever joins it from our Communion does what in him lies to bring back that darkness, by weakening the Church which mainly keeps it in check; and, since their Communion is one, he makes himself responsible for the corruption elsewhere prevailing; he countenances in others, what in his own person he avoids.

But, besides these difficulties from without, there will be, it must be added, others from within; a system, practical and reverent, as is the true Catholic system in our Church, tends more than any other, by God's grace, to produce a sense of responsibility in those who embrace it; still no scheme of doctrine will in itself protect those who hold it: in any extensive revival of doctrine, truths will be very unequally received, and will

be perverted by those who do not receive them in "an honest and true heart;" some will take them up as a beautiful theory, as matter of imagination, and these "having no root in themselves," will "in time of temptation fall away;" others will embrace them with ardour and affection, but without self-discipline and humility, and these too, it is to be feared, secure that they are standing, and not "taking heed," will fall. There are many forms of unreality; many ways in which those who are unreal, may deceive themselves, and seem to themselves wheat when they are but chaff; and, as being such, will be carried away out of the barn-floor by the sifting wind of temptation, whenever it is permitted to blow upon them. This the writers of the Tracts cannot help; they may lament to hear of persons allowing themselves in the habit of speaking indignantly of sins committed at the time of or in the English Reformation, instead of humbling themselves for "their own sins and the sins of their forefathers," and acknowledging that what we have is more than we deserve, more than we realize, is what is best fitted for us[l]; it is sad to see or hear of persons, talking and not acting; fasting, as has been said, in theory and in their studies[m]: it is sad to see people apparently prizing

[l] Tract 86. "Indications of a superintending Providence in the preservation of the Prayer book, and in the changes which it has undergone."

[m] Geraldine.

what is Catholic for its novelty not for its holiness; or tempting God, by approximating as near as they may to Romanism, and thinking that they shall not fall into it; but surely it is responsibility enough, not directly to encourage any evil tendencies. Since men "wrest Scripture to their own damnation," how much more must the words of frail man be liable to abuse.

Those, also, who have been God's chief instruments in the great work of restoring half-forgotten doctrine,—I mean our friend himself, and the Author of the Christian Year,—have again and again repeated, that the change which is going on around us is "not[n] satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movement of individuals on a particular spot." They have declined the praise; let them not unduly bear the blame. In part, we must all bear it; no one can doubt that if the system of our Church were fully carried out, her doctrine fully taught, her holy precepts acted up to, her devotions offered "in spirit and in truth," her Communions frequent and frequented as she desires, her self-denying training followed,—in a word, if all the means of grace, of which she is made the channel, were realized as they ought, God's blessing would so rest upon us, that we should have nothing to fear for our Vine; "they who pass by," would not then "pluck off her

[n] Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 27. British Critic, No. 50. "State of religious Parties."

grapes;" she would then have such marks of holiness, that they who now "gather themselves together against her would fall unto her;" her children, of whom she has been bereaved, would be restored unto her; nay, she herself might be carried to a yet higher condition; the discipline, whose loss she laments, be restored; she might, besides the hidden saints formed by her holy training, have those also who should visibly be saints, tokens, even to the world, of God's sanctifying Presence in her, like those of old, who were termed "Apostles of the nations." In whatever degree she is not such, we have all, more or less, our share of guilt; our sins, our negligences, the coldness of our intercessions, our listlessness or untamed energy, our want of holiness—each of us may know the plague of his own heart—have all contributed to deprive her of God's intended blessing, and to keep her where she is. Let us not then seek to excuse ourselves or cast the blame upon others; it is not to excuse my friends—much less myself who am least and last—that I have said even thus much, but lest "the truth" should be "evil spoken of;" let us not care where the blame lies in man's sight, but rather let us all seek, more and more, to "humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt us in due time."

Such seems to me the position which one should wish for our whole Church; this does not seem to me to have been enough realized; the sensitiveness

at some of our friend's strong language[n] on the actual condition of the Church implies this; we have been for some time on the defensive; we have been maintaining her character, as a pure and Apostolic Church, against the calumnies of men, rather than confessing before God, "for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and Thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us," and praying Him, "cause Thy Face to shine upon the sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake." To joy is more congenial than to weep; our natural love and piety towards her, as it makes us hope all good for her, and think all good of her, indisposes us to admit that there is any thing lacking to her; we think of her more, as God's Providence has formed her, than as by the remissness of our forefathers and our own, she has become; more of what she is in the abstract and in theory, than what she is, as a living, moving, acting, holy, Power, the depository of Divine graces and powers, destined not to struggle only with the world (as she is more and more) but to overcome it; not to have store of food only for such of her children as will receive it, but to bring them up, guide, restrain them; we think of the beautiful organization which her Lord has given her, that He has provided her with every thing needful for

[n] "Till her members are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church sit still; let her be content to be in bondage; let her work in chains;" &c. Tract, 90. p. 4.

all the functions of His body, and forget that through our sins she is in a state of powerlessness, His instrument still, yet not adequately performing the high destinies for which He formed, has again and again delivered, and yet preserves her.

Our true position seems to be, to acknowledge that we have fallen and that God is raising us up; amid much which is humbling, there are many cheering signs that the hand of God is with our Church; by looking exclusively on either side of the picture, we should risk forming a tone of mind, other than what is intended for us; we might be unduly elated, and forget our humility, or unduly depressed, and forget God's mercy. Our vine has been "burnt with fire and cut down," but "its branch is" again "tender and putting forth leaves," and giving signs of an approaching summer. Our Heathen populations; the extent of schism among us; fresh and fresh divisions, drawing away some of our more earnest members; our internal disunion, paralyzing our efforts, and wasting our energies; the fewness of those who share in works of piety or charity; our greediness of gain in order to minister to our luxuries; the indifference about holy things openly professed; the absence of any high standard or dislike to it; the appalling strides of a lawless infidelity; these and much besides are saddening proofs of a past and present winter; but the source of our hopes is not in ourselves; we seem ice-bound, but "He bloweth with His Spirit, and the

waters flow;" the clods of our valleys seem yet hard, but "He maketh it soft with the drops of rain, and blesseth the increase of it;" our hope is not in ourselves nor in men; but that the Lord of the Vineyard is "looking down" graciously "from heaven, beholding, and visiting this Vine, and the vineyard which His right hand planted, and the branch which He made strong for Himself,' and that it is He Who is "sending out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river." A high destiny seems to be yet in store for our Church; it is for her sake, we may hope, that her and our people are being carried into every corner of the world: certainly, to contrast her state, as she was towards the close of last century, without a single Bishop, out of these Islands, and as she now is every where in possession of her complete Apostolic constitution, though not in the degree she needs it, yet as centres from which she may spread, one has ground to hope that the "multiplying of the people" is to "increase her joy;" her Bishops shortly will be in every continent as well as in the isles afar off; her Episcopate (notwithstanding the sore blow which cut off her Irish Bishoprics) is already more than doubled; she is not dwindling, as sects after a time do, but growing; in the United States she has been quadrupled, while the population has doubled; she is there recognized even by those without her, as the only principle of stability in their land; hearts are turned unto her; some she has gathered

in; and it seems only a question of time, when the severed bodies shall be gathered into her, and it shall be seen, when she shall have enfolded the rest within her, which is indeed Moses' rod and given by God, which the formation of man; every step is an earnest of the final issue; it seems already to be felt extensively among them, that she alone is the bulwark against Romish errors, and they seem to be preparing to take refuge under her shadow.

And with this outward extension, she is every where giving signs of life; life in different forms, some regular, some irregular, more or less imperfect, yet still life; every where her members seem more alive to her true character, and so, we may trust, will more act up to it; and zeal, which has hitherto so often sought a vent without her, will be concentrated within her, and devote itself, in some allowed way, to remedy the great wants of our people; her prayers and Communions are again becoming more frequent; in some places, her two days of humiliation, her Litany days; elsewhere daily; her Communions are weekly in some places where they were monthly, and monthly Communions are becoming the ordinary provision even for her village Congregations; and with increased Communions, they who partake of them are increased also, and there is increased faith and sense of their value, and so, we may trust again, fresh life poured into the Church from the Fountain of life; her Lents and weekly fasts are more

observed, " self-denial (fasting) and almsgiving, the wings of prayer," are growing; her care for Christ's lambs, her thought of Christ's poor, (deficient as it yet is,) are increasing; there is (as you will have witnessed in this place) a more devout, an humbler spirit than heretofore, even at that most trying period of human life; the deposit of our Faith is more reverenced; there is a yearning after the holy days of the Church's " first" virgin " love;" our very divisions, we may hope, are marks of earnestness; persons whom I cannot but think to be partially in error, are in reality contending not for the error but for the truth, which is in their minds bound up with it, not against truth, but against some error which they have identified with others' statement of the truth. What God is preparing us for, for doing or for suffering, He only knoweth; yet one cannot but hope that He is preparing us for something; Romanists and Protestants alike have their eyes upon our Church; who knows but that for us may be reserved the office of " turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers?" A thoughtful Romanist, lately, even when speaking against foreign Protestants, anticipated that if the Church were ever to be again one, it must be through our's, " which being both Catholic and Reformed, had her hands upon both." Only " it is not for" us " to know the times or the seasons which The Father hath put

in His own power;" much less to anticipate them. Enough that we "see our signs;" and that "the way in which we should go" is "made plain before our face." "A thousand years is with the Lord as one day," and He can make one day do the work of a thousand years. We have our office plainly marked out for us, (as has been often said,) to labour to act up to the principles of our Church, and to lead others to do the same; so shall we be formed, and aid (under the Divine grace) to form others in the mould, of "godliness, righteousness, and soberness of life," provided in her; we have but to seek to form ourselves and others in His holy Faith and the keeping of His commandments, and commit our Church and ourselves to Him, to deal with us, as in His Infinite Mercy He may vouchsafe. I cannot but hope, that they too, whose minds have been, from whatever cause, unsettled and tending to Romanism, will yet be stayed, and seeing the hand of God with our Church, "abide, wherein they have been called, with God," and forsake not the Church in which they were baptized, but await the end. Change from any Church is an act of solemn responsibility; much more would it be from one, to which, as our friend has developed, God has given the notes of "possession, freedom from party-titles, life, ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church[a];" much more

[a] British Critic, No. 53. Catholicity of the English Church.

still, when God's hand is visibly with her. To leave her at such a time might be a very wilful and presumptuous act, going, as far as man's wilfulness can, to oppose the Divine counsels and defeat His good purposes; it may be, perhaps, again true, "except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved." One must fear too, lest such, voluntarily foregoing the full use of the Holy Eucharist, as it is vouchsafed to them in their own Church, might provoke God to lessen His grace, as rejecting His Gifts. But, as I said, let us act up to the principles of our Church, and these brethren, who, from whatever excuse, have been allowed thus to be tempted of Satan to forsake the Church wherein God placed them, will be in less risk of being led into sin; their mother will not have to lament the loss of those whom she has nourished up and who may be valuable children to her.

It may be long ere the issue comes; at present, the course pointed out to the several Churches seems to be to amend themselves, to become again what they once were, even though imperfect; to "return to their first deeds;" so may they, through repentance and amendment of life, and keeping the commandments, be led to further knowledge of the truth, and in the end be restored to unity, if this blessing be yet in store for the Church. At least such seems the course which things, under God's guidance, are taking. Thus even the Greek Church is again become pro-

selytizing; the Gallican Church is sending out Missionaries and praying for our conversion, shewing her new life, in part, in seeking to extend her own Communion; in Prussia, religion is reviving in connection with Lutheran doctrine; we are being guided back to the principles of our Church; we seem thus to be taught, as our friend concisely said, that "we are to go back, not to go over;" repentance and zeal must come first, union afterwards; union is to be looked for, as God's gift, to be prayed for, not compassed by man's device; "it is God that maketh men to be of one mind in a house:" our duties then lie not now towards Rome; our present path and duties are plain;—with ourselves; to fit ourselves to be His instrument: how we may be employed, when fitted, we cannot foresee and so should not forestall; it may be that our first office will be, not with Rome, but with those bodies which were separated from Rome at the same time as ourselves, but were not so signally blessed and preserved; it may be, that through us what is lacking in them to the full gifts of a Church is to be supplied; it may be, that "our light shining before men," they are thus to be led to "glorify our Father which is in Heaven;" and thus we may be reunited with the rest of Christendom, not alone nor selfishly, but decked with the rich jewelry of them whom we have won back to Primitive Faith and Discipline. It may be too the very way, in which it may please God, that

the rest of the Church Catholic should be brought to love and respect, and seek to be one with, us, that we have aided to restore to Catholicity those who have gone away from it. Our office then is with ourselves and within ourselves, ready to do acts of charity to those severed from us, as far as we may without compromise, but not seeking untimely union. Such schemes have been baffled before, when things seemed most favourable, and so, a mark set upon them. As unity is perhaps a means to the greater holiness of the whole Church, so also holiness may be a condition of the restoration of unity. Let us act up to the principles of our Church, and realize her worship, her fastings, her repentance, her humiliations, her praise, her intercessions, her high standard of holy life, her exalted charity; live up to what is evidently Catholic in her; develope, as occasion requires, those Catholic points, which, though she has them, do not lie upon the surface; in a word, be raised to what our Church should be; and who knows but that He Who raises us up, may purify Rome too, and St. Peter be the type of the Church of St. Peter, and her Lord yet cast His gracious look upon her, and she weep bitterly her fall, and she, being "converted, strengthen" her "brethren," and deserve to be restored to the preeminence, which while she deserved, she had; and the Western Church be reunited, not on any plan of human wisdom, of compromise or concession, but in holiness

and Primitive Faith? Who knows, again, whether it may not be His gracious will to reunite His whole Church at once, and why should we then direct our eyes to the Western Church alone, which, even if united in itself, would yet remain sadly maimed, and sadly short of the Oneness she had in her best days, if she continued severed from the Eastern? After a long separation, in which we have not been known by name to the Eastern Church, much less our real character, God seems again to be opening to us ways of kindly intercourse with some portions of her, which must increase love, which will also, under God's blessing, help her to restore the holiness and knowledge of her early years, and therewith, make her wish to understand us better, and be united to us. All union of our distracted Christendom "is impossible with man; with God" it is as "possible," (and one may add it may be as likely to be His will,) to unite His whole Church in one, at once, whenever His time may be, as any single portions of it. We pray that God would "have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics, and fetch them home to His flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one fold under One Shepherd:" why not hope, as we also continually pray, that the whole Church also may visibly become such a fold? that God would "inspire His universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord?" Such longings, (ac-

cording to the heads of good Bishop Andrews' daily intercession,) for the good estate of the "Church Catholic; Eastern; Western; our own," as they set before us a nobler end, so are they more accordant with our Church's feelings as expressed in her Liturgy, and they are safer. The Church Catholic can only be re-united on Catholic principles; the very thought and longing carries us back to her pure days and her Œcumenical Councils, and primitive faith and holiness; it awakens our sympathies only for an object upon which they may rest without risk. On the other hand, longing for re-union with any branch of the Church, as the Roman, naturally tends to make man gloss over the difficulties, and shut their eyes to the actual corruptions, which we should now be called upon to recognise or to sanction; it creates sympathies not for her, as she once was, a "pure Virgin," but for her very defilements: the very fact, that it seems more within the compass of human means, tends to make men impatient of hindrances, which it seems as though God had placed, and desirous to remove them or set them aside in an unholy way. Let us long, not for what may be brought about by a mere blending of our own practical unholiness and short-comings with the corruptions of another Church, thereby to aggravate in the sight of God the very offensiveness of what is severally amiss in us; but rather let us long for what, being evidently beyond the reach of man's device, leads us at once

to the throne of God, thence to expect it from the Great Head of the Church as He would give it, in holiness and holy love. We know not what may be, and so our duty is the easier, not to act as though we knew it; rather to "do with all our might what our hand" now "findeth to do," not to run before, but to follow after; not to plan or devise for ourselves, but to act where God leads. Be we zealous, earnest, patient, humble; "He Who cometh will come, and will not tarry;" and it may be, "His kingdom" will sooner "come," if we in our Church follow His gracious guidance.

May God give us grace, in these difficult days, more and more "perfectly to know His Son Jesus Christ to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life, that following the steps of His holy Apostles—we may stedfastly walk in the way that leadeth to eternal life, through the same His Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

Ever your very affectionate Friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church,
Feast of S. Philip and S. James,
1841.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. *page* 109.

Archbishop Ussher on the difference between ancient and modern Invocation of Saints, from his Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge, p. 445 sqq.

"—That we may the better understand, and more distinctly apprehend, how far the recommending of men's selves unto the prayers of the Saints, which began to be used in the latter end of the fourth age after Christ, came short of that invocation of Saints, which is at this day practised in the Church of Rome: these special differences may be observed betwixt the one and the other.

"First, in those elder times, he that prayed silently was thought to honour God in a singular manner; as one that 'brought[a] faith with him, and confessed that God was the searcher of the heart and reins and heard his prayer, before it was poured out of his mouth;' the understanding of the present secrets of the heart, by the general judgment of the Fathers, being[b] no more communicated by Him unto the creatures, than the knowledge of things to come; for before the Day wherein the secrets of the heart shall be manifested, 'Almighty[c] God alone doth behold the hidden things,' saith St. Hierome, alleging for proof of this, the text Matt. 6, 4. 'Thy Father That seeth in secret;' Psalm 7, 9. 'God searcheth the hearts and reins;' and 1 Kings 8, 39. 'Thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men;' but now in the Church of Rome mental prayers are presented to the Saints as well as vocal, and they are believed to receive both the one and the other.

"Secondly, in the former times[d] it was a great question, whether at all, or how far, or after what manner, the spirits of the dead did know the things that concerned us here: and con-

[a] Amb. de Sacr. vi. 4.

[b] Quæstt. ad Antioch. ap. Ath. t. 2. p. 303.

[c] Hier. l. 5. in Ezech. c. 16. l. 4. in Ezech. c. 14. l. 4. in Jerem. c. 20. l. 1. in Matt. c. 9. Chrys. in Matt. Hom. 29. Gennad. de Eccl. dogm. c. 81. Cass. Collat. 7. c. 13. Sedul. in Rom. 2. Paschas. de Sp. S. ii. 1; et alios passim.

[d] Aug. in Ps. 108. enarr. 1.

sequently, whether they pray for us only 'in[e] general,' and for the particulars God answereth us according to our several necessities, where, when, and after what manner He pleaseth. Anselmus Laudunensis, in his interlineal gloss upon that text, 'Abraham is ignorant of us and Israel knoweth us not,' (Is. 63, 16.) noteth that Augustine saith, that 'the dead, even the Saints, do not know what the living do, no not their own sons.' And indeed St. Augustine in his book of the care for the dead[f], maketh this inference upon that place of Scripture. 'If such great Patriarchs as these were ignorant, what was done to the people that descended from them, unto whom (believing God) the people itself was promised to come from their stock; how do the dead interpose themselves in knowing and furthering the things and acts of the living?' and afterwards draweth these conclusions from thence, which Hugo[g] de Sancto Victore, borrowing from him, hath inserted into his book De spiritu et anima, cap. 29. 'The[h] spirits of the dead be there, where they do neither see nor hear the things that are done or fall out to men in this life[i].' 'Yet have they such a care of the living, although they know not at all what they do, as we have care of the dead, although we know not what they do.' 'The[j] dead indeed do not know what is done here while it is here in doing: but afterward they may hear it by such as die and go unto them from hence; yet not altogether, but as much as is permitted to the one to tell, fit for the other to hear. They may know it also by the angels, which be here present with us and carry our souls unto them, they may know also by the revelation of God's Spirit such of the things done here which is necessary for them to know.'—

And then having further shewn that Gratian (Decr. p. 2. caus. 3. qu. 2. c. 29.) holds that the saints do not know what is done here; that P. Lombard holds it not *incredible* that they do, and that "our petitions are made known to them in the Word of God which they contemplate" (l. iv. dist. 45.) that Scotus (ib. q. 4.) and Gab.

[e] Aug. de Cur. pro Mort. c. 16. "That the Saints in general are concerned for the Church, and can pray, and do in fact pray for it, is confessed by Melancthon, (Conf. Aug. art. de Invoc. Sanct.) Brentius, (Conf. Wirtemb. c. de Inv. Sanct.) Chemnitz (Exam. Conc. Trid. c. 3). Calvin also (Inst. 3. 20, 21, and 24) is not opposed to this opinion." Bellar. de Missâ, ii. 8.

[f] c. 13.

[g] Lib. de Sp. et An. t. 3. Op. Aug. qui id. est cum l. 2. de Anim. inter. Op. Hug. Vict.

[h] In de Cur. pro Mort. c. 13. [the book is later than both, containing extracts from both, see Aug. Opp. t. vi. App. p. 39. ed. Ben. The passages alleged by Abp. Ussher are from a genuine work.]

[i] Ib. c. 14.

[j] Ib. c. 15.

Biel. (in Can. Miss. lect. 21.) hold it" *probable* that God specially reveals to them prayers made to them, he thus contrasts the positiveness of later writers.

Cardinal Bellarmine[k] supposeth, that 'if the Saints should have need thus of a new revelation, the Church would not so boldly say unto all the Saints, 'Pray for us,' but would sometime entreat of God[l], that he would reveal our prayers unto them.' Yet because 'it seemeth unto him superfluous to desire ordinarily of them that they should pray for us, which cannot ordinarily understand what we do in particular, but know only in general that we are exposed to many dangers;' he resolveth, that, 'although[m] there may be some doubt, in what manner the Saints may know things that be absent, and which are sometimes delivered by the affection of the heart alone; yet it is certain that they do know them.' 'And you must note,' says Dr. Pesantius[n], 'that this is to be held for a point of faith, that the Saints do know the prayers, which we pour unto them, *because* otherwise they should be made in vain.' So that to make good the Popish manner of praying unto Saints, that which was at the first but probable and problematical, must now be held to be *de fide* and an undoubted axiom of divinity.

"Thirdly, in the Popish invocation, formal and absolute prayers are tendered to the Saints, but the compellations of them used at first, were commonly either wishes only or requests of the same nature with those which are in this kind usually made unto the living; where the requester is oftentimes superior to him whose prayers he desireth, (which standeth not well with the condition of prayer properly so called,) and they that are requested, be evermore accounted in the number of those that pray for us, but none of those that are prayed unto by us. Of this you may hear, if you please, what one of the more moderate Romanists writeth. 'If[o] it were lawful for the Prophet to call to the Angels and the whole host of Heaven, and to exhort them that they would praise God, which notwithstanding they do continually without any one admonishing them, whereby nothing else but a certain abundance of desire of the amplifying of God's glory is declared: why may it not be lawful also out of a certain abundance of godly desire to call upon those blessed spirits which by the society of the same body are conjoined with us; and to exhort them, that they should do that, which we believe they otherwise do of themselves?' That to say, 'All ye

[k] De Eccl. Triumph. l. 1. c. 20.
[l] Id. de Purg. 2. 15.
[m] l. 1. c. 20. ut sup.
[n] In 1. pt. Thom. Quæst. 12. art. 10. Disp. 7. Conc. 6.
[o] G. Cassand. Schol. in Hymn. Eccl. Op. p. 224.

Saints, pray unto God for me;' should import as much, as if it were said, 'Would to God, that all the Saints did pray unto God for me!' 'I wish earnestly that all the Saints should pray to God for me.' Thus writeth Cassander, in his notes upon the ancient ecclesiastical hymns, published by him in the year 1556, who being challenged for this by some others of that side, added this further to give them better satisfaction, 'When[p] I did see that it was not necessary that we should hold that the Saints do understand our prayers; I thought it was sufficient to put back the calumnies of some, if we should say that these interpellations might be expounded by way of wishing or desiring: which hath less absurdity in it, and is agreeable to the examples of the holy Scriptures. But if any man would have such compellations as these to be taken also for an intimation of the desire, and a direct speaking unto them, I do not gainsay it. Notwithstanding I would think that a tacit condition ought to be understood in such an intimation: such as Gregory Nazianzen doth express in the formal oration of his sister Gorgonia when he saith, if thou hast any care at all of our speeches, and holy souls receive this honour from God, that they have notice of such things as these, do thou accept this oration of ours.'

Then, having shewn that even "in the very darkest times of the Papacy" "some famous men" were related to have thought such prayers superfluous, "many" that they were only prayers to God "that the merits of the Saints may help us," not properly to themselves, he adds a

"Fourth difference betwixt the Popish prayers and the interpellations used in the ancient time. For by the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome, the Saints in Heaven are not only made joint petitioners with us, (as the Saints are upon earth,) but also our attorneys and advocates; who carry the suit for us, not by the pleading of Christ's merits alone, but by bringing in their own merits likewise, upon the consideration of the dignity or condignity whereof it is believed, that God yieldeth to the motions they make unto Him on our behalf. 'We[q] pray unto the Saints (saith the Master of the Sentences) that they may intercede for us, that is to say, that their merits may help us, and that they may will our good; for they willing it, God doth will it, and so it will be effected.' 'We ought to intreat the Apostles and the other Saints (saith Hugo[r] de Prato) in all our necessities; because they are our advocates and the means

[p] Id. Ep. 19. ad Molin. p. 1109.
[q] Petr. Lombard. Sent. l. 4. Dist. 45. and Jacob. de Vitriac. in Lit. maj.
[r] Serm. 35.

betwixt us and God, by whom God hath ordained to bestow all things upon us.' 'Because it is a thing fitting,' (saith Scotus[s],) 'that he that is in bliss should be a coadjutor with God in procuring the salvation of the elect according to such manner as this may agree unto him; and to this it is requisite that our prayers, which are offered unto him, should especially be revealed unto him, because they lean especially upon the merits of him as of a mediator bringing us to the salvation which is sought for; therefore it is probable that God doth specially reveal unto him that is in bliss such of our prayers as are offered unto him or unto God in his name.' But this is an open derogation to the high prerogative of our Saviour's meritorious intercession, and a manifest encroachment upon the great office of mediation, which the most religious and learned among those Fathers, who desired to be recommended unto the prayers of the Saints, were so careful to preserve entire unto Him. 'For what is so proper to Christ,' saith S. Ambrose[t], 'as to stand by God the Father for an Advocate of the people?' 'He is the Priest,' saith S. Augustin[u], 'who being now entered within the veil, Alone there of them that have been partakers of the flesh, doth make intercession for us.'—

"Fifthly, the recommendation of men's selves unto the prayers of the Saints deceased, which was at first admitted in the ancient Church, did no way impeach the confidence and boldness which we have gotten in Christ, to make our immediate approach to the throne of Grace; which by the invocation of Saints, now taught in the Church of Rome, is very much impaired. For to induce men to the practice of this, the great Majesty of God and the severity of His justice is propounded unto poor sinners on the one hand, and the consideration of their own baseness and unworthiness on the other. Whereupon it is inferred, that as well for the manifesting their reverence for God's Majesty, as the testifying of their submissness and humility, they should seek to God by the mediation of His Saints; like as men do seek unto the king by the mediation of his servants. Which motives can have no more force to encourage men to the invocation of Saints, than they have to discharge them from the immediate invocation of God and His Christ. So among the causes alleged by Alexander of Hales[x], why we ought to pray unto the Saints; one is 'in respect of our want in contemplating, that we who are not able to behold the highest Light in Itself, may contemplate it in His Saints;' another 'in respect of our 'want in loving: because we miserable men (miserable men indeed that do so) or some of us, at least, are more affected

[s] In 4. Sent. Dist. 45. Quæst. 4.
[t] In Ps. 39.
[u] In Ps. 64.
[x] Summ. pt. 4. Quæst. 26. memb. 3. art. 5.

sometimes unto some Saint, than unto our Lord Himself; and therefore God, having compassion on our misery, is pleased that we should pray unto His Saints;' and a third 'in respect of the reverence of God; that a sinner who hath offended God, because he dareth not to come unto Him in his own person, may have recourse unto the Saints by imploring their patronage.' The like we read in Gabriel Biel[y], handling the same argument. 'This is a singular consolation (saith he) to sinners, who have oftentimes more mind to the interpellation of the Saints than of the Judge: whose defect of holiness also, other men's goodness is able to supply:' and it maketh[z] 'for the reverence of God, that a sinner who hath offended God, as it were, not daring for the dross of his sin to appear in his proper person, before the most high and dreadful Majesty, should have recourse unto the Saints, who are most pure and grateful to God: who may present the sinner's prayers unto the Most High, and by adjoining their merits and prayers thereunto, might make the same more fit for the audience, more pleasing and more grateful.' Therefore, Salmeron[a], the Jesuit, sticketh not to deliver his opinion plainly; that the praying unto God by the Saints seemeth to him better than the praying unto Him immediately, as for other reasons, 'so because the Church, which hath the Spirit of Christ; (though St. Augustine surely would have judged such a Church to have been led by the spirit of Antichrist rather than of Christ;) 'most frequently hath recourse unto God by the Saints, but cometh more rarely unto God by itself;' and also because the praying of God by the invocation of Saints doth argue greater humility; as may be seen in the Centurion, (Luke 7, 6. 7.)' whereunto he applieth also the saying of David, 'He hath had a respect to the prayer of the humble, and did not despise their prayers[b];' and of Judith, 'The prayer of the humble and meek hath always pleased Thee.'

"Thus in the days of the Apostles themselves, under the pretence of humility[c], some laboured to bring into the Church 'the worshipping of Angels,' which carried with it 'a shew of wisdom,' (as St. Paul speaketh of it,) and such a shew as was not far unlike unto that wherewith our Romish Doctors do cozen simple people nowadays. 'For this' (saith Theodoret[d]) 'did they counsel should be done,' (namely, that men should pray unto Angels,) 'pretending humility, and saying that the God of all things was invisible and inaccessible and incomprehensible,

y In Canon. Miss. Lect. 30.
z Lect. 31.
a In 1 Tim. 2. Disp. 7. sect. ult.
b Ps. 102, 17. Judith 9, 16.
c Coloss. 2, 18. 23.
d In Col. 2.

and that it was fit we should procure God's favour by the means of angels,' whereas St. Chrysostom [e], treating of Christian humility, sheweth that the faithful who are furnished with that grace, do notwithstanding 'ascend beyond the highest tops of heaven, and passing by the Angels present themselves before the regal throne itself.—

"Sixthly, The Romanists repose such confidence in the intercession of the saints, that they look to receive far greater benefit by them, than by their own prayers. Which conceit how distasteful it was to the ancient Doctors, St. Chrysostom [f] may be a sufficient witness, who laboured exceedingly to root out this erroneous opinion, when it first began to shew itself in his time. And therefore he is bold to affirm, not only that we have no such needs of others, that we may entreat by them, but also that God then doth most, when we do not use the entreaties of others.—

"Seventhly and principally it is to be considered, that invocation is attributed to Saints in the Church of Rome as a part of the worship due unto them: yea as eximium adorationis genus, (for so doth Cardinal Bellarmine [g] pronounce it to be,) 'an eminent kind of adoration.' For 'we do not honour the Saints' (saith Azorius [h] the Jesuit) 'with that worship only wherewith we do men that excel in virtue, wisdom, power, or any other dignity, but also with Divine worship and honour which is an act of Religion. For that worship which is given to men of excellency, is an act and office not of Religion, but of another inferior virtue, which is called observance.' And whereas it is as clear as the noonday, that the giving of divine honour and worship unto any creature is flat idolatry, the poor man weeneth that he and his fellows may be excused from being idolaters, because they do not give divine worship and honour unto the Saints for themselves, but for God Who hath made them Saints: as if God, Who cannot endure that His glory should be given unto another, would be mocked with such toys as these. Indeed they were wont heretofore to delude men commonly with an idle distinction of Dulia and Latria [i], but now, 'it [k] is the opinion of the most and the wisest of them, that it is one and the selfsame virtue of Religion which containeth both Latria and Dulia.' Whereas it hath been the constant doctrine of the ancient Church, that all religious worship (whereof prayer by the judgment of all men, as well Heathen as Christian, hath been always esteemed to be an

[e] In Matt. Hom. 65.
[f] In Act. 16. Hom. 36.
[g] Præf. in Controv. de Eccl. Triumph.
[h] Instt. Mor. t. 1. l. ix. c. 10.
[i] They are used as equivalent, Constt. Ap. iii. 7.
[k] Nic. Serarius Litaneut. 2. q. 27. fin.

especial part) is so properly due to God Alone, that without committing of idolatry it cannot be communicated to any creature. For 'in the Catholic Church it is divinely and singularly delivered, that no creature is to be worshipped by the soul, but He only Who is the Creator of all things,' saith St. Augustine[k]. And therefore the ancient Doctors, who thought it not amiss that men should recommend themselves unto the prayers of the Saints departed, held it a thing intolerable notwithstanding, to impart unto any man or angel the worship of invocation. For to request the help of the prayers of our fellow servants is one thing, and to worship them with the service of invocation is another; as may be seen in the case of our brethren here on earth, who may not refuse the former without the violation of charity, nor accept the latter at our hands without an open breach of piety.

"Now that the Fathers judged no otherwise of prayer than hath been said, this may be one good argument; that when they define it, they do it with express reference to God and no other, as may be seen in those five several definitions thereof which Bellarmine himself repeateth out of them.

Then, having set these down, and having shewn that the Council of Laodicea anathematized such as invocated Angels[l], and produced sayings from the Fathers to the effect that God only is to be invocated, and "condemning the worship of Angels or any other creature whatsoever," he gives the following sad details from the later ages, and these the more melancholy, since they are not obscure individuals, but men great in their day, who so speak, evidencing how deeply seated these corruptions were in the later Church;

'There[m] wanted not such as would interpret that speech of the Angel unto the holy Virgin, 'Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee:' of the equality of her empire with her Son's; as if it had been said, 'Even as He, so thou also dost enjoy the same most excellent dignity of ruling. In[n] the redundance and effusion of grace upon the creatures, the Lord's power and will are so accommodated unto thine, that thou mightest seem to be the first in that both diadem and tribunal. The Lord is with thee: not so much thou with the Lord, as the Lord is with thee, in that function.' Then it was taught for good Divinity, that 'from[o] the time wherein the Virgin-mother did conceive in her womb

[k] De quant. anim. c. 34. add de mor. Eccl. Cath. c. 30.

[l] The Latin Canonists substituted "angulos" for angelos."

[m] Eman. de Valle de Moura S.T.P. ac Inquisit. Deputatus, Opusc. 1. de Incantat. 1. Ensalmis, s. 1. c. 1. n. 46.

[n] Ib.

[o] Bern. Sen. Serm. 61. art. 1. c. 8.

the Word of God, she hath obtained such a kind of jurisdiction (so to speak) or authority in all the temporal procession of the Holy Ghost, that no creature hath obtained any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of His holy Mother;" that "because[p] she is the Mother of the Son of God Who doth produce the Holy Ghost, therefore all the gifts, virtues and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth." That she[q] hath singularly obtained of God this office from eternity; as herself doth testify, Prov. viii. 23. 'I was ordained from everlasting,' namely, a dispenser of celestial graces; and that in[r] this respect, Cant. vii. 4. it is said of her, 'Thy neck is a tower of ivory,' because that as by the neck the vital spirits do descend from the head into the body; so by the Virgin the vital graces are transmitted from Christ the Head into His mystical body, the fulness of grace being in Him, as in the head from whence the influence cometh, and in her as in the neck through which it is transfused unto us; so that take away the patronage of the Virgin, you stop as it were the sinner's breath that he is not able to live any longer.

"Then men stuck not to teach, that unto her "all[t] power was given in heaven and in earth." So that for "heaven" when our Saviour ascended thither, this might be assigned for one reason (among others) why He left His mother behind Him, "lest[u] perhaps the Court of Heaven might have been in a doubt whom they should rather go to meet, their Lord or their Lady;" and for "earth" she[x] might rightly apply unto herself that in the first of Ezra "all the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord given unto me." And we may say unto her again that in Tobit xiii. "Thy kingdom endureth for all ages." And in the cxliv. or cxlv. Psalm, "Thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages." That howsoever she was "the[y] noblest person that was or ever should be in the World, and of so great perfection, that although she had not been the Mother of God, she ought nevertheless to have been the Lady of the world; yet according to the laws whereby the world is governed, by the right of inheritance she did deserve the principality and king-

[p] Id. ib.
[q] Id. ib. art. 3. c. 3.
[r] Id. ib. art. 1. c. 8. art. 2. c. 10. ex Pseudo-Hieron. Serm. de Assumpt. Mariæ. Jo. Herolt. in Serm. Discip. de Temp. Serm. 163. Blas. Viegas in Apoc. c. 12. Comm. 2. s. 10. n. 1. 2.
[s] Viegas, ib. s. 2. n. 6.
[t] P. Damian. Serm. 1. de Nat. B. Mariæ. t. 5. Surii Sept. 8.
[u] Anselm de Excell. B. Virg. c. 7. and following him, Bern. de Bust. in Mariali, p. 11. Serm. 1. p. 3. and Seb. Barrad. Jesuit. Conc. Evang. vi. 11.
[x] Bern. de Bust. l. c. pt. 12. Serm. 1. pt. 1.
[y] Bern. Sen. Serm. 61. art. 1. c. 7.

dom of this world." That "Christ[m] never made any legacy of His Monarchy: because that could not be done without the prejudice of His Mother; and He knew besides that the Mother could make void the Testament of the Son, if it were made unto her prejudice. And therefore that by all this it appeareth most evidently, that Mary the Mother of Jesus by right of inheritance hath the regal dominion over all that be under God." That "as[n] many creatures do serve the glorious Virgin Mary, as serve the Trinity. Namely, all creatures, whatsoever degree they hold among the things created (whether they be spiritual as angels, or rational as men, or corporal as the heavenly bodies or the elements) and all things that are in heaven or in earth, whether they be the damned or the blessed; all which being brought under the government of God, are subject likewise unto the glorious Virgin, forasmuch as He Who is the Son of God and of the blessed Virgin, being willing as it were to equal in some sort His Mother's sovereignty unto the sovereignty of His Father, even He Who was God did serve His Mother upon earth. Whence Luke ii. 51. it is written of the Virgin and glorious Joseph: 'He was subject unto them,' that as the proposition is true, All things are subject to God's command, even the Virgin herself: so this again is true also, All things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God Himself." That "considering[o] the blessed Virgin is the Mother of God and God is her Son, and every son is naturally inferior to his mother, and subject unto her, and the mother hath preeminence and is superior to her son; it therefore followeth that the blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God Himself is subject unto her in respect of the Manhood which He assumed from her," that "howsoever[p] she be subject unto God inasmuch as she is a creature: yet is she said to be superior and preferred before Him, inasmuch as she is His Mother."

"Then men were put in mind that "by[q] sinning after Baptism they seemed to contemn and despise the Passion of Christ: and so that no sinner doth deserve that Christ should any more make intercession for him to the Father: without whose intercession none can be delivered either from the eternal punishment or the temporal, nor from the fault which he hath voluntarily committed. And therefore that it was necessary that Christ should constitute His well-beloved Mother a Mediatrix betwixt us and Him," "and[r] so in this our pilgrimage there is no other

[m] Id. ib.
[n] Id. ib. c. 6.
[o] Bern. de Bust. Marial. p. 9. Serm. 2.
[p] Id. p. 2. Serm. 2.
[q] Jac. de Valent. Episc. Christopol. in expos. Cant. V. Mariæ Magnificat.
[r] Id. ib.

refuge left unto us in our tribulations and adversities but to have recourse unto the Virgin Mary our Mediatrix; that she would appease the wrath of her Son." That "as[s] He is ascended into heaven to appear in the sight of God for men; (Heb. ix. 24.) so she ought to ascend thither to appear in the sight of her Son for sinners; that so mankind might have always before the face of God, a help like unto Christ for the procuring of his salvation." That "this[t] Empress is of so great authority in the palace of Heaven, that it is lawful to appeal unto her from any grievance, all other intermedial Saints omitted."—"That[u] she is a Chancellor in the court of heaven, and giveth letters of mercy only in this present life; but for the souls that depart from hence, unto some letters of pure grace, unto others of simple justice, and unto some mixed of justice and grace. For some (say they) were much devoted unto her: and unto them she giveth letters of pure grace, whereby she commandeth glory to be given them, without any pain of Purgatory. Others were miserable sinners and not devoted to her; and unto them she giveth letters of simple justice, whereby she commandeth that condign punishment be taken of them. Others were lukewarm and remiss in devotion; and to them she giveth letters of justice and grace together: whereby she commandeth that both favour be done unto them, and yet some pain of Purgatory be inflicted upon them for their negligence and sluggishness." And these things they say "are signified in Queen Esther; who wrote letters that the Jews should be saved, and the enemies should be killed, and to the poor small gifts should be given." Yea further also, where[x] King Ahasuerus did proffer unto the said Esther even the half of his kingdom, (Esther v. 3.) thereby (they say) was signified that God bestowed half of His Kingdom upon the blessed Virgin. "That having justice and mercy as the chiefest goods of His Kingdom, He retained Justice unto Himself, and granted Mercy unto her:" and "therefore[y] that if a man do find himself aggrieved in the Court of God's Justice, he may appeal to the Court of Mercy of His Mother," she being that 'throne of grace' whereof the Apostle speaketh (Heb. iv. 16.), 'Let us go boldly unto the throne[z] of Grace, that we may receive Mercy, and find Grace to help in time of need.' They tell us that[a] it is for the ornament of an earthly Kingdom, that

[s] Bern. de Bust. Marial. p. 11. Serm. 2. memb. 1.
[t] Id. p. 3. Serm. 3. in Excell. 4.
[u] Id. p. 12. Serm. 2. memb. 1. in. Excell. 22.
[x] Gabr. Biel. in Can. Missæ. lect. 80. vid. Joh. Gerson. tract 4. sup. Magnificat.
[y] Bern. de Bust. Marial. p. 3. Serm. 3. in Excell. 4.
[z] Id. ib. Exc. 5. and p. 5. Serm. 7. in fin.
[a] Id. p. 9. Serm. 2.

it should have both a King and a Queen, and therefore when any king hath not a wife, his subjects often do request him to take one. Hereupon they say, that the eternal King and omnipotent Emperor, minding to adorn the kingdom of Heaven above, did frame this blessed Virgin, to the end He might make her the lady and Empress of His kingdom and empire; that the prophecy of David might be verified, saying unto her in the Psalm: 'Upon Thy right hand did stand the Queen in clothing of gold.' That "she[b] is an Empress because she is the spouse of the eternal Emperor: of Whom it is said, (John iii. 29.) He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom, and that when God did deliver unto her the empire of the world and all the things contained therein, He said unto her that which we read in the first of the Æneids:

> His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono;
> Imperium sine fine dedi.

"That she is "the Empress[c] also of heaven and earth, because she did bear the heavenly Emperor; and therefore that she can ask of Him what she will, and obtain it. That this was figured in the history of the Kings, where the mother of Solomon said unto him: 'I desire one petition of thee, do not confound my face:' for then should He confound her face if He did deny that which she requested;" and that "if in respect of her maternal jurisdiction she hath command of her Son Who was subject unto her: (as we read, Luke ii. 51.) then much more hath she command over all the creatures that are subject to her Son." That "this[d] mighty God did (as far as He might) make His Mother partner of His Divine Majesty and power; giving unto her of old the sovereignty both of celestial things and mortal; ordering at her pleasure (as the patronage of men did require) the earth, the seas; Heaven and Nature; at her liking, and by her, bestowing on mortal men His Divine treasures and heavenly gifts. So as all might understand that whatsoever doth flow into the earth from that eternal and glorious fountain of good things, doth flow by Mary." That "she[e] is constituted over every creature; and whosoever boweth his knee unto Jesus, doth fall down also and supplicate unto His Mother; so that the glory of the Son may be judged, not so much to be common with the Mother as to be the very same." That

[b] Id. P. 3. Serm. 3. Excell. 4.
[c] Id. Ib.
[d] Horat. Turselin. Jesuit. and in Ep. Dedic. Hist. Lauret. ad Card. Aldobrandinum.
[e] Arnold. Carnot. Tract. de Laud. Virg.

" so[f] great is her glory that she exceedeth the nature of Angels and men joined together, as far in glory, as the circumference of the firmament exceedeth his centre in magnitude, when she understandeth herself in her Son to be, as His other self, clothed with the Deity." That she being " the Mother[g] of God doth assume unto herself of the omnipotency of her Son (upon which she leaneth) as much as she pleaseth." And that she " doth[h] come before the golden altar of human reconciliation not intreating only but commanding; a Mistress, not a Maid." They tell us that the blessed Virgin herself appeared once unto Thomas Becket and used this speech unto him, " Rejoice[i] and be glad and be joyful with me: because my glory doth excel the dignity and joy of all the Saints and all the blessed spirits; and I alone have greater glory than all the Angels and Saints together. Rejoice, because that as the Sun doth enlighten the day and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world. Rejoice, because the whole host of Heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoureth me. Rejoice, because my Son is always obedient unto me and my will, and all my prayers He always heareth." (Or as others[k] do relate it, " The will of the Blessed Trinity and mine is one and the same; and whatsoever doth please me the whole Trinity with unspeakable favour doth give consent unto.") " Rejoice, because God doth always at my pleasure reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come. Rejoice, because I sit next to the holy Trinity, and am clothed with my body glorified. Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys shall always stand, and never be finished or fail. And whosoever by rejoicing with these spiritual joys shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence; and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it in the sight of my Son, that it may possess joys with me." They tell us that " many (many whores[l] for example, that would not sin on Saturday for the reverence of the Virgin, whatsoever they did on the Lord's day) seem to have the blessed Virgin in greater veneration than Christ her Son; moved thereunto out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the Son of God doth bear with the simplicity of these men and women, because He is not ignorant that the honour of the Mother doth redound to the Child." (Prov. xvii. 6.) They argue further that " if[m] a Cardinal have this

[f] Bern. de Bust. Marial. P. 12. Serm. 2. Excell. 21.
[g] Id. P. 12. Serm. 2. Excell. 28.
[h] P. Damian. Serm. 1. de Nat. B. Mariæ.
[i] Bern. de Bust. Marial. P. 20. Serm. 2. sect. ult.
[k] Promptuar. Discipuli de Miraculis B. Mariæ, Exempl. 14. p. 8. ed. Mogunt. 1612.
[l] Bern. de Bust. P. 6. Serm. 2. Memb. 3.
[m] Id. P. 12. Serm. 1. Memb. 3.

privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby: then by an argument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the blessed Virgin is able to deliver us from all evil, her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils; she would presently rescue him, and not permit that any one should have an evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown." They add moreover, that "for[i] every of these crowns a man shall obtain 273758 days of indulgence: and that Pope Sixtus the Fourth granted an indulgence of 12,000 years for every time that a man in the state of grace should repeat this short orizon or salutation of the Virgin, which by many is inserted into her crowns. 'Hail, most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of Heaven, the gate of Paradise, the Lady of the world. Thou art a singular and pure Virgin: thou didst conceive Christ without sin: thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the world, in Whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil, and pray for my sins. Amen.'" In the crowns composed by Bonaventure, this is one of the orizons that is prescribed to be said, 'O[k] Empress, and our most kind Lady, by the authority of a mother command thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly unto heavenly desires;' which is suitable to that versicle, which we read in the 35th Psalm of this Lady's Psalter; 'Incline[l] the countenance of God upon us, compel Him to have mercy upon sinners,' the harshness whereof our Romanists have a little qualified in some of their editions, reading thus, "Incline[m] the countenance of thy Son upon us, compel Him by thy prayers to have mercy upon us sinners." The Psalms of this Psalter do all of them begin as David's do, but with this main difference, that where the Prophet in the one aimeth at the advancement of the honour of our Lord, the Friar in the other applieth all to the magnifying of the power and goodness of our Lady. So in the first Psalm: Blessed is the man (quoth Bonaventure) that loveth thy name, O Virgin Mary, thy grace shall comfort his soul; and in the others following; Lady[n], how are they multiplied that trouble me? with thy tempest shalt thou persecute and scatter them. Lady[o], suffer me not to be rebuked in the fury of God, nor to be judged in His wrath. My Lady[p], in thee have I put my trust: deliver me from my enemies,

[i] Ib. [k] Bonaventura Corona B. M. V. Opp. t. 6. Romæ, 1588.
[l] Psalt. B. M. V. 26. [m] Psalt. Bonaventuræ seorsim editæ. Paris. 1596, in Capeleto Dominicæ 2. [n] Ps. 3. [o] Ps. 6. [p] Ps. 7.

O Lady. In our Lady[p] put I my trust; for the sweetness of the mercy of her name. How[q] long wilt thou forget me, O Lady, and not deliver me in the day of tribulation? Preserve[r] me, O Lady, for in thee have I put my trust: and impart unto me the drops of thy grace. I[s] will love thee, O Lady of heaven and earth, and I will call upon thy name among the nations. 'The heavens[t] declare thy glory: and the fragrance of thine ointments is spread among the nations.' Hear[u] us, Lady, in the day of trouble; and turn thy merciful face unto our prayers. Unto thee[x], O Lady, have I lifted up my soul: in the judgment of God, by thy prayers, I shall not be ashamed. Judge me[y], Lady, for I have departed from my innocency, but because I will trust in thee, I shall not be weakened. In thee[z], O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be confounded: in thy favour receive me. Blessed[a] are they whose hearts do love thee, O Virgin Mary; their sins by thee shall mercifully be washed away. Lady[b], judge those that hurt me: and rise up against them and plead my cause. Waiting[c] have I waited for thy grace; and thou hast done unto me according to the multitude of the mercy of thy name. Lady[d], thou art our refuge in all our necessities; and the powerful strength treading down the enemy. Have mercy[e] upon me, O Lady, who art called the mother of mercy, and according to the bowels of thy mercies, cleanse me from all mine iniquities. Save[f] me, Lady, by thy name and deliver me from mine unrighteousness. Have mercy[g] upon me, O Lady, have mercy upon me: because my heart is prepared to search out thy will, and in the shadow of thy wings will I rest. Let[h] Mary arise; and let her enemies be scattered: let them all be trodden down under her feet. In thee[i], O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be put to confusion: deliver me in thy mercy, and cause me to escape. Give[k] the King thy judgment, O God, and thy mercy to the Queen His Mother. Lady[l], the Gentiles are come into the inheritance of God, whom thou by thy merits hast confederated unto Christ. Thy mercies[m], O Lady, will I sing for ever. God[n] is the Lord of revenges, but thou the mother of mercy dost bow Him to take pity. O come[o] let us sing unto our Lady; let us make a joyful noise to Mary, our Queen, that brings salvation. O sing[p] unto our Lady a new song, for she hath done marvellous things. O[q] give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good: give thanks unto His Mother, for her mercy endureth for ever. Lady[r], despise not my praise: and vouchsafe to accept

[p] Ps. 10. [q] Ps. 13. [r] Ps. 16. [s] Ps. 18. [t] Ps. 19.
[u] Ps. 20. [x] Ps. 25. [y] Ps. 26. [z] Ps. 31. [a] Ps. 32.
[b] Ps. 35. [c] Ps. 40. [d] Ps. 46. [e] Ps. 51. [f] Ps. 54.
[g] Ps. 57. [h] Ps. 68. [i] Ps. 71. [k] Ps. 72. [l] Ps. 79.
[m] Ps. 89. [n] Ps. 94. [o] Ps. 95. [p] Ps. 98. [q] Ps. 107 and 118.
[r] Ps. 109.

this Psalter which is dedicated unto thee. The[s] Lord said unto our Lady, Sit thou, My mother, at My right hand. They[t] that trust in thee, O mother of God, shall not fear from the face of the enemy. Except[u] our Lady build the house of our heart, the building thereof will not continue. Blessed[x] are all they who fear our Lady, and blessed are all they who know to do thy will and thy good pleasure. Out[y] of the deep have I cried unto thee, O Lady: Lady, hear my voice. Lady[z], remember David, and all that call upon thy name. O[a] give thanks unto the Lord, because He is good: because by His most sweet Mother the Virgin Mary is His mercy given. Blessed be thou[b], O Lady, which teachest thy servants to war, and strengthenest them against the enemy. And so the last Psalm is begun with, Praise our Lady in her Saints, praise her in her virtues and miracles; and ended accordingly, with, Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram; Let every spirit (or every thing that hath breath) praise our Lady."

To this we may adjoin the Psalter[c] of the salutations of the Virgin, framed by John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, which is not yet printed. His preface he beginneth thus: 'I purpose to write the praises of the Holy Virgin; who delivers us from prison through her Son, quickening our whole race by a work wondrous in efficacy:' and endeth with a prayer to the Blessed Virgin, 'that she would release the sins of all those for whom he prayed, and cause both his own name and theirs to be written in the book of life.' Then followeth his first Psalm; wherein he prayeth, that 'she would make us to meditate often God's law,' and, afterwards 'to be made blessed in the glory of God's kingdom.' His other 149 Psalms (which are fraught with the same kind of stuff) I pass over. But Bernardinus de Senis[d], his boldness may not be forgotten; who thinketh that "God will give him leave to maintain, that the Virgin Mary did more unto Him, or at least as much, as He Himself did unto all mankind, and that we may say for our comfort, (forsooth) that in respect of the blessed Virgin (whom God Himself did make notwithstanding), God after a sort is more bound unto us, than we are unto Him." With which absurd and wretched speculation, Bernardinus de Busti[e] after him was so well pleased, that he dareth to revive again this odious comparison.—"But O most grateful Virgin, didst not thou something to God. Didst not thou make Him any recompence? Truly, (if it be lawful to speak it) thou in some respect didst

[s] Ps. 110. [t] Ps. 125. [u] Ps. 127. [x] Ps. 128. [y] Ps. 130. [z] Ps. 132. [a] Ps. 136. [b] Ps. 144.

[c] Called by J. Pits, de Ill. Angl. Script. p. 380. Psalter. Medit. B. Mariæ.

[d] Serm. 61. art. 1. c. 11.

[e] Marial, p. 6. Serm. 2. memb. 3.

greater things to God, than God Himself did to thee and to all mankind. I will therefore speak that, which thou out of thy humility hast past in silence. For thou only didst sing, 'He that is mighty hath done to me great things,' but I do sing and say, that 'thou hast done greater things to Him that is mighty.'" Neither is that vision much better, which the same author[f] reciteth as shewed to St. Francis, or (as others[g] would have it) to his companion Friar Lion; touching the two ladders that reached from earth to heaven; the one red, upon which Christ leaned, from whence many fell backward and could not ascend; the other white, upon which the holy Virgin leaned: the help whereof such as used, were by her received with a cheerful countenance, and so with facility ascended into Heaven. Neither yet that sentence, which came first from Anselm[h], and was after him used by Ludolphus Saxo[i] the Carthusian, and Chrysostomus à Visitatione[k] the Cistercian Monk: that "more present relief is sometimes found by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling upon the Name of our Lord Jesus her only Son." Which one of our Jesuits[l] is so far from being ashamed to defend, that he dareth to extend it further to the mediation of other Saints also; telling us very peremptorily, that "as our Lord Jesus worketh greater miracles by His Saints than by Himself (John xiv. 12.) so, often He sheweth the force of their intercession more than of His own."

All which I do lay down thus largely[m], not because I take any delight in rehearsing those things, which deserve rather to be

[f] Ib. p. 9. Serm. 2. assim. 2.

[g] Spec. vit. Fransisci et socior. ej. p. 2. c. 45. Spec. exempl. dist. 7. exempl. 41.

[h] de Excell. B. Virg. c. 6.

[i] de Vita Christi, p. 2. c. 60.

[k] de Verb. Dominæ, t. 2. l. 2. c. 2.

[l] H. Fitz-Simon of the Mass, l. 2. p. 2. c. 3.

[m] Melancholy as all this, it is only a specimen of what might be produced; thus Whitaker (adv. Camp. Rat. 9. p. 44.) quotes from the Prosa Missæ de Concept. "Thou art the sure hope of the miserable, truly the mother of the parentless, thou art the relief of the oppressed, the medicine of the weak, *thou art all things to all*;" and from a book of "hours" entitled the Hist. sec. chorum August. de Comm. Beatiss. Virg. Mariæ (Opp. p. 219.) framed, (which is the more shocking) on the Magnificat, which it corrects, "Rejoice, heavenly Lady, exalt and magnify God thy Saviour, Who made thee alone of thy kind; thou willedst to call thyself the 'handmaiden' of Jesus Christ, but as the Divine law teaches, thou art Mistress over Him (tu ipsius es Domina) for right and reason have it, that the mother should be set over (præesse) the son; therefore pray suppliantly and direct with authority (præcipe sublimiter) that in the eventide of the world He lead us to the kingdoms above;" and "Thou alone peerless whom the Lord chose to be mediatrix between God and man, &c." and in "the Office to her, reformed by Pius V." "Mary mother of grace, mother of mercy, do thou protect us from the enemy, and receive us at the hour of death."

buried in everlasting oblivion; but first, that the world may take notice, what kind of monster is nourished in the Papacy under that strange name of Hyperdulia: the bare discovery whereof, I am persuaded, will prevail as much with a mind that is touched with any zeal of God's honour, as all other arguments and authorities whatsoever. Secondly, that such unstable souls as look back upon Sodom and have a lust to return unto Egypt again, may be advised to look a little into this sink, and consider with themselves, whether the steam that ariseth from thence be not so noisome, that it is not to be endured by one that hath any sense left in him of piety. And thirdly, that such as be established in the present truth, may be thankful to God for this great mercy vouchsafed unto them.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the above has been in type, I have been furnished with a melancholy confirmation of the truth of Mr. Newman's words, that the "received doctrine of the Roman schools of that day" is "unhappily that of this day too;" that

"The present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity—it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the Blessed Virgin and the Saints."[a]

It would probably be a first impression on reading these extracts from Abp. Ussher, that he had with much learning brought together a mass of objectionable language, which it might be hoped was now done away; that all these were the exaggerations of individual minds, and that it was not fair to charge them as teaching now received in the Roman Church. This was my own hope; I reprinted them in illustration of the meaning of the Article, but certainly, little thinking of imputing them to Rome at the present day. The contrary, however, of all this is sadly the case. The same extracts which Abp. Ussher adduces as illustrating the difference between "the Romish doctrine of the invocation of Saints" and ancient addresses

to them, are, in "the Glories of Mary Mother of God by Saint Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest," (third ed. Dublin, 1837,) adduced as authoritative teaching. The subjects of the early chapters, which they are adduced to establish, are "how great should be our confidence in Mary, Queen of Mercy," (§. 1) "as our Mother," (§. 2.) "the great love borne us by Mary, our Mother," (§. 3.) that "Mary is *the* refuge of repentant sinners" and so (§. 4.) "our life, since she obtains us the pardon of our sins," (c 2. §. 1.) "because she obtains us perseverance," (§. 2.) "the *necessity* of Mary's intercession in order to obtain salvation," (c. 5.) &c. The sayings of Bernardine of Sienna, Albertus M., Bonaventure, &c. are alleged as authorities. It is still alleged as a true saying, "All is subject to Mary's empire, even God," (p. 138, see Abp. Ussher, above p. 196.) It is not, of course, to be supposed that no mention should be made of her SON, or from time to time that her intercession is available through her SON, or that "Jesus is our Redeemer, Mary our Advocate." (p. 88.) "Jesus is my only hope, and after Him you, O Virgin Mary" (p. 90.) One could not imagine any thing written by a Christian in entire forgetfulness of his Lord; but these are but scanty; the main object of the work is, (as it professes,) "the Glories of Mary," and these are so set forth, as for the most part to end in her, to place her where a Catholic would expect mention of his Lord. Thus at the hour of death, it is said, "May I invoke you during life, and die when calling on—Mary, my Mother, my blessed amiable Mother." (p. 38.) To whom again could it be thought that such language as the following is addressed?

"If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? during life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul, p. 74. I desire to consecrate myself more particularly to your service—dispose of me according to your good pleasure; direct me; I abandon myself wholly to your conduct; never more let me be guided by myself; chastise me, if I disobey you; your correction will be sweet and agreeable. (Ps. cxli. 5.) I am then no longer mine, *I am all yours.*" (p. 30.) "My sins render me unworthy of approaching you. I should expect nothing but chastisement from your hands.—I place in you *all my confidence,* and provided I may be happy enough to die before your image, I shall firmly hope to join in heaven that innumerable multitude who have been saved by

your intercession." (p. 53, 4.) "How dare a sinner, unworthy as I, appear before you? I am the last of sinners; I have offended the Divine Majesty more than any other; since I cannot recall the past, help me to amend the present." (p. 57.) "O consolation of the afflicted! have pity upon me; remorse of conscience gnaws me; my best actions are but imperfectly performed; hell awaits to carry off my soul; divine Justice must be satisfied; what then shall become of me? what shall be my eternal lot?" (p. 83.) "He who is protected by you cannot be lost; heaven and earth confess it. Hence though all creatures forget me, though the whole world abandon me, provided you forsake me not, I should think myself secure." (p. 90.) "I cannot abandon myself to despair; because you are my refuge, and your clemency is unbounded." (p. 135.) "All power has been given unto you in heaven and on earth; nothing is impossible to you, for you can give hope to the desponding." (p. 138.)

Again, it is, of course, presupposed and sometimes expressed that S. Mary is a mediatrix with our Lord, that her power is derived from Him, and through Him; but then, at best, it is a power absolutely vested in her; it is not the Intercession of a creature, however exalted; it is the will of one, whose will is complied with and obeyed. She stands between the soul and its Judge; it need not go to its Judge; it has but to gain the intercession of His Mother, and leave the rest to her.

"Because she opens at pleasure the abyss of the Divine mercy, no sinner, however enormous his crimes may be, can perish if he is protected by Mary." (p 25.) "Every petition she offers is as a law emanating from the Lord, by which He *obliges Himself* to be merciful to those for whom she intercedes." (p. 24.) "You have the keys of the Divine mercy, draw on this inexhaustible treasure, and dispense its riches to this poor sinner, in proportion to his immense wants." (p. 136.) "When Mary," says S. Peter Damian, "presents herself before Jesus, the altar of reconciliation, she rather seems to dictate than to supplicate, and has more the air of a Queen than a subject"—"the saint (Bernardine) wishes to insinuate that God hears Mary's prayers, as if they were commands." 'The Lord, O Mary, has so exalted you,' says S. Anselm, 'that His favour has rendered you omnipotent.' 'Yes,' says Richard of S. Laurence, 'Mary is omnipotent, for according to all laws the queen enjoys the same privileges as the king, and that power may be equal between the Son and the Mother.'" (p. 138.) "Albertus M. makes you say, 'It suffices to entreat me to desire a thing, for whatsoever I wish is neces-

sarily accomplished.'" (p. 139.) "All good comes to us with Mary; he who has found her, has found all grace, all virtue, since there is no good, which he does not obtain through her intercession. She herself warns us that she has *at her disposal all the treasures of the Divinity.* 'With me are glory and riches, that I may enrich them that love me.' Hence S. Bonaventure wishes us ever to keep our eyes on the hands of Mary, to receive from them all that is necessary for our true welfare." (comp. Ps. 123, 2.) p. 88. "Another time, our Blessed Lord said to Mary in the presence of St Gertrude, 'I know that in virtue of My Omnipotence I have invested you with power to deal out mercy in such a measure as you find good, to all sinners who invoke you.'" (p. 104, 5.) "We, holy Virgin, hope for grace and salvation from you, and since you need but say the word, ah, do so, you shall be heard, and we shall be saved." (p. 144.)

To add one more definite statement from a popular and authoritative work, the "Treatise on the Scapular," (c. 7. p. 43.)

"It is a Catholic proposition, that the most sacred Virgin Mary, by a *participated* authority, granted to her as Mother of Jesus Christ, can do much in all things, where mercy doth contend with justice. Wherefore S. Anselm saith, "There is no doubt but the Blessed Virgin Mary, by maternal right, is with Christ president of heaven and earth. S. John Damascene saith, It is fitting and convenient that Mary should possess what is her Son's.—Hence we may infer how the Blessed Virgin can free the souls of her devouts out of purgatory, and fulfil her other promises made to the brothers and sisters of the holy Confraternity; to wit, by a power communicated to her by her Son. For she being really Mother of the Word Incarnate, there is in all propriety due to her a certain power, or, as others say, a dominion over all things, as well spiritual as temporal, to which the authority of her Son doth extend itself. So that she hath by a natural right of maternity, a power almost like that of her Son, of which she may serve herself, as often as she shall think good. Relying therefore on this *her participated omnipotency*, and on the efficaciousness of her merits and intercessions, she promised the devouts of her holy habit to free them from the temporary pains of purgatory fire, from the eternal pains of hell-fire, and from many dangers and calamities of this life, as well spiritual as temporal."

Yet this has been said yet more strongly in "the Glories

of Mary," that she not only "partakes His Omnipotence," but that He has "resigned" it to her.

"Now the King of heaven, Whose bounty is infinite, desiring nothing so ardently as to confer His favours on us, in order to increase our confidence in Him, has given us His Mother for our Mother, and in her hands resigned, (if we might say so,) His omnipotence in the sphere of grace, that we might place in her the hope of our salvation, and all the help necessary to attain it." (p. 85.)

And this power they are fond of representing as belonging to her, not as the creature of whom our Lord deigned to take our nature, but (as before in Abp. Ussher, p. 195. 196. 198. 199. 202.) derived from her own merit towards her Son, as the result of a debt which He owed her. They are painfully fond of placing her in the same relation as The Father.

"Mary owes her Son an infinite gratitude for choosing her for His Mother, but it is not less true to say that Jesus Christ has contracted a species of obligation towards her for the human existence He received from her, and in recompense for this benefit, He honours her by hearing her prayers." (ib. p. 26, 7.)

"Mary has not spared her own Son, her own soul, for the salvation of many." p. 32. "If to evince the love of God the Father for man it is said, that 'He delivered up His own Son for them;' may we not use the same terms, to express the love of Mary? 'Yes,' says S. Bonaventure, 'Mary has so loved us, that she has given us her only Son.' 'She gave Him us,' says F. Nieremberg, 'when in virtue of her jurisdiction over Him as mother, she permitted Him to deliver Himself up to the Jews.' 'She gave Him for us—she hath given this Well-Beloved Son; she sacrificed for us a Son, Who was infinitely dearer to her than herself.' 'If *our* salvation was then so near her heart.' (p. 41—43.) 'This Divine Saviour Whom she has given to the world.' (p. 131.) 'Richard of S. Laurence beautifully explains this passage, (Prov. xxx. 11.) in reference to the holy Virgin, 'The heart of the man of God who trusts in Mary, he shall not want spoils,' for she has snatched from hell its prey, to enrich with spoils our Lord Jesus Christ."

"In taking flesh in your chaste womb, a God has been pleased to become your debtor, in order to place afterwards at your disposal all the treasures of His unbounded mercy," (p. 144.) "as it was revealed to S. Bridget, Jesus has obliged Himself to grant all the desires and requests of His blessed Mother, not willing to

refuse her any thing in heaven, since she has refused Him nothing on earth." (p. 138, 9.)

" S. Germanus says to Mary, 'You, O holy Virgin, have over God the authority of a Mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners.'"

So that at last it seems nothing strange, that she should be introduced as upbraiding an apostate, " Thou hast renounced *me* and my Son," (p. 135.) or that she should be addressed by a penitent, " I have by my impurity sinned against God and against *thee*," (p. 80.) or with the attribute of Divinity, " O sweet in *communicating*[a] thyself to those that love you, to those that seek you." (p. 193.)

It is, of course, believed in the abstract, that our Lord is the One Mediator with the Father, and the blessed Virgin a mediatrix only with our Lord; Rome is not charged with denying, but with overlaying the Faith by her additions; but practically, at the best, where is the inducement held out to a sinner to go further than the blessed Virgin, when it is taught that she has all power given her, that she obtains what she wills, that persons need only pray to her? Certainly it is said that none can be saved who do not pray to her, but it is not taught (but the contrary) that those will not be saved who pray to none besides her, who never pray to God. Nor can this be paralleled with the Catholic doctrine of prayer to the Father through the Son; undoubtedly, there may be a form of unconscious Unitarianism lurking under exclusive prayer to our Lord; (as it would also be un-Scriptural and un-Catholic;) but, at least, in such prayers, prayer is offered to Him Who with the Father and the Holy Ghost is One God; in these prayers to the Virgin, the creature is substituted for the Creator as the object of prayer.

Such, it is much to be feared, must be the effect of this teaching on common minds; but, at the very best, her office, as thus set forth, practically takes the place of that which our Blessed Lord deigns to bear. The feelings of

[a] It seems but a following out of this teaching that a heresy is said to exist among the lower ranks in Rome, that in the Holy Eucharist, not only our Lord but His Mother is present. Such a heresy would, again, naturally follow from such teaching as, " Mary and Jesus having but one and the same Flesh, says S. Arnand Abbot, why should not the Mother enjoy, conjointly with the Son, the honours of royalty?" The application to the Holy Eucharist seems to lie nearer, and were not more profane, than that actually made.

devout affection, trust, and hope amid our sins, "boldness in approaching to the throne of grace," consciousness that we have One Who can have a feeling for our infirmities, which, in the Catholic system, are directed towards our Lord, as being man although God, in the Romanist are turned aside to His Mother. Our Lord is contemplated as God and our Judge, the blessed Virgin has that office which, in the Catholic system, is occupied by the glorified Humanity of our Lord; justice and mercy are no longer met together, but justice is apportioned to our Lord, His other attribute of mercy is divided from Him and given to His Mother. The soul is invited, not to lift itself up to Him, but to rest in His Mother, as finding in her the very attributes, which Holy Scripture and the Catholic Church set forth to us in our Lord.

Some painful evidence of this has been already given by Abp. Ussher; these statements are repeated, and enforced to this day:

"Mary is Queen of mercy alone; she is a sovereign, not to punish sinners but to pardon and forgive them.—Gerson observes that as the kingdom of God consists in mercy and justice, the Lord has, as it were, divided it; reserving to Himself the dominion of justice, and yielding to His Mother that of mercy. S. Thomas confirms this, when he says, that one half of the kingdom of God was given to Mary, when she conceived and brought forth the Eternal Word, so that she became Queen of mercy as her Son is King of justice. A learned interpreter, writing on Ps. lxxii. 1. says to God, 'Lord, you have given justice to the King your Son, because you have reserved mercy for the Queen His Mother.' S. Bonaventure and Ernest Abp of Prague, explain the words in nearly the same terms," (p. 23;) "Let us go then, Christians, let us go to this most gracious Queen, and crowd around her throne, (comp. Heb. iv. 16.) without being deterred by our crimes and abominations. Let us be convinced that Mary has been crowned Queen of mercy, it is that the greatest sinners may be saved by her intercession."[b] (p. 27, 28.) "Prayer in the mouth of a sinner—is useful and salutary, S. Thomas says, being founded not on the merits of him who prays, but on the goodness of God and the merits of Jesus Christ.—It is just the same with our petitions made in the name of His most holy Mother. If he who prays merits not to be heard, the merits of Mary will pray for him, says S. Anselm, exhorting all sinners to address themselves

[b] The shocking vision of the "two ladders," (see above, in Abp. Ussher, p. 203.) is repeated, p. 180.

confidently to—the Mother of God." (p. 51.) "S. Bernardine of Sienna asserts, that 'if God has not destroyed man after his sin, it was in consideration of—the blessed Virgin! and out of the singular love He bore her; he even doubts not that all the mercies granted to sinners in the old law have been given in consideration of—Mary! With good reason then does S. Bernard exhort us to seek grace through her since she has found the grace which we have lost. It is [not for herself, 'who needed it not, being by her' (immaculate) 'conception full of grace;'"] 'it is for sinners,' says Cardinal Hugo, 'that Mary has found grace, which they had irretrievably lost. Hence let them come, and say to her with confidence, render us what belongs to us." (p. 59.) "I shall no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can repair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful than hell; or your Son justly irritated, since one word from you will appease Him. I shall only fear myself, and that forgetting to invoke you, I shall be lost." (p. 74.) "If my Saviour drive me off because of my sins, I shall go and cast myself at the feet of His Mother; thence I shall not rise, until she has obtained my pardon; for she does not know what it is to be insensible to the voice of misery, and her pity will soften the anger of her Son. Regard us then, O Mary most merciful, for we your servants place all our hope in you." (p. 89.) "'The sun,' says Hugo, 'is a figure of Jesus Christ, whose splendid rays illumine the just who live in the day of grace; the moon is typical of Mary, whose mild lustre illumines sinners amid the dreary night of sin.' 'It is towards this propitious orb,' says Innocent III., 'that he who is buried in the shades of iniquity should look.' Having lost divine grace, the day disappears, there is *no more sun for him*; but the moon is still on the horizon; let him address himself to Mary." (p. 91.) "'This strong hold,' says Albertus M., 'is the sacred Virgin established in grace and glory.' Once introduced to her let us be silent, for it does not become us to open our mouth before the Lord, Whom we have so much offended, but leave Mary to speak and intercede for us." (p. 92.) "The glorious S. Bonaventure, to animate our confidence in Mary, represents to us a raging sea, in which sinners, already fallen from the vessel of divine grace, are tossed about by the billows of temptation, torn by the gnawings of remorse, and horrified by the terrors of Divine Justice, without light or guide, are ready to be swallowed up in the gulf of despair; but just then the Lord shews them Mary the star of the sea, and seems to say to them, 'Sinners, unfortunate sinners, despair not, fix your eyes on this bright luminary; its lustre will save you from the tempest, and conduct you to the port of salvation.' Blosius figures Mary to us, as the *only* refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." (p. 93.) "The prophet

complained—'Lord, we have sinned, and there is none to restrain your arm from falling heavy upon us;' but now Mary presents herself between God and His offending creatures.—Richard of S. Laurence also observes on this subject, that in the old law, God often complained that there was none to interpose between Him and sinners, but since Mary, the mediatrix of peace, has appeared on earth, she restrains His arm and averts His wrath." (p. 94.) "S Anselm, in order to increase our confidence in Mary, assures us that our prayers will often be more speedily heard in invoking her name than in calling on that of Jesus Christ, and the reason he gives is, that Jesus being no less our Judge than our Saviour, He must avenge the wrongs we do Him by our sins, while the holy Virgin being solely our advocate, is obliged to entertain only sentiments of pity for us."

This is thus reconciled with the belief, which of course, Romanists must hold, that there is but "One Mediator between God and man."

"We are far from insinuating, *nevertheless*, that she is *more* powerful than her Son. Jesus Christ is our only Mediator; He alone has obtained our reconciliation with God His Father; but as in recurring to Him, Whom we must necessarily consider a Judge Who will punish the ungrateful, it is probable a sentiment of fear may lessen the confidence necessary for being heard, it would seem that in applying to Mary, whose office is that of mercy, our hope would be so strong as to obtain all we ask for." (p. 103.)

The explanation, however, leaves the fact as it was, that St. Mary is set forth as a more desirable Advocate than our Lord.

"How is it, that whereas we ask many things of God without obtaining them, we no sooner ask through Mary than they are granted us?" ib.

"As we have not access to The Father but by Jesus Christ, we have not access to Jesus Christ but through Mary, that this Divine Saviour Whom she has given to the world, may receive us from her hands. Who could know God except by you, O holy Virgin? who could be saved, O powerful Virgin, except through your intercession?" (p. 131.) Hugh of S. Victor exhorts us, if we are deterred by apprehension of the Divine Majesty, to approach to Mary without fear. She is, it is true, holy and spotless, the Queen of the Universe and the Mother of God, but she is also a pure creature, and a child of Adam like unto us. "If

you fear to approach to God, look to Mary; then thou findest nothing to fear; thou seest thy own race." (p. 191.)

And these recommendations are enforced by the history of great sinners who were saved, having sought mercy of Mary alone.

"In my last moments, abandoned by all, and seeing myself loaded with sins, I addressed this prayer to the Mother of God, 'O thou, the refuge of the forsaken, have pity on me! Hope of the universe, my only hope, come to my assistance.' This little supplication was not made in vain. Mary obtained for me the grace of true contrition, by means of which I escaped Hell." (p. 40. see also p. 54—57.) "'I promised my Mother most readily (to recite the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin every day), and never failed to keep my word amid all my debaucheries; nay, I confess that for the last ten years it is the only act of religion I ever performed,' the confessor now saw clearly, that the conversion of this young man was owing to the special protection of Mary," (p. 90.)

These intercessions of S. Mary are represented also,

"As not only useful but necessary to this great end (our salvation), not of an absolute necessity, it is true, but of a moral necessity, which has its source in the Divine will." (p. 116.)

"Poor souls, what are you thinking of when you abandon Mary, when you cease crying to her for protection? 'Take away the sun,' says S. Bernard, 'and what does the world become? An abode of horror, a chaos of confusion; thus, let a soul abandon Mary, and she is seated in darkness, that darkness which the Holy Spirit says, 'favours the passage of the beasts of the forest.' 'Woe to him,' says S. Anselm, 'who despises the light of this sun, that is, who neglects Mary; it is soon night with him, and his soul becomes a haunt of sin and of devils.' S. Francis Borgia doubted, and with reason, of the perseverance of such as had not a special devotion to Mary. Enquiring one day of the novices, to which saint each one was most devoted, he perceived, that some among them were wanting in devotion to the blessed Virgin, whereupon he noticed the master of novices, and desired him to have a particular watch on these young people. The event justified the saint's fears; all those who had not honoured Mary, lost the grace of their vocation and quitted the society. S. Germanus then had reason to call Mary, 'the respiration of Christians;' for as the body cannot exist without breathing, so the soul cannot live without recurring to the Mother of God." (p. 67.)

"'Blessed Virgin,' says S. Anselm, 'as it is impossible, that he who neglects and despises you, can be saved, so it is impossible, that he who has recourse to you sincerely, can be lost.' S. Antonius says, 'As those from whom Mary turns her merciful eyes, cannot be saved, it necessarily follows, that those on whom she looks with benignity, will share in eternal glory.' And here let us ask, if the words, 'It is impossible that he who is devout to Mary,' should not make those tremble, who despise or neglect her? Let all such hear the anathema pronounced against them by Albertus Magnus; 'The people who will not serve you shall perish.' And S. Bonaventure, 'He who neglects Mary, shall die in his sins—he who does not invoke her, shall have no share in the kingdom of God;' and again, 'There is no hope of salvation for those from whom Mary turns her face.'—"On the contrary, Mary assures us, that 'He who hears her, shall not be confounded.' S. Bonaventure says, 'Great Queen! he who perseveres in your service, is far from damnation.' 'No,' adds S. Hilary, 'he will not be lost, although he might have hitherto grievously offended his God." p. 167.

And thus not only is S. Mary held out to returning sinners as a Mediatrix more suited to them than our Lord, but as *the* special means, whereby they who stand may be kept upright.

"We have the same hope as this great saint, and shall not cease to say with S. Bonaventure, 'O Mary, I have hoped in you, and shall never be confounded.' (p. 172.) S. Philip Neri used to say, 'My children, if you wish to persevere, be devout to Mary.' The venerable Berchman, S. J. said also, 'That he who loves Mary, will persevere to the end.' And Abbot Rupert draws from the parable of the prodigal a very ingenious reflection to the same effect. 'If this libertine child,' said he, 'had his Mother, he would never have abandoned his paternal home, or he would have returned sooner:' thus he who has Mary for Mother, never abandons God, or if he does, he soon seeks Him again. Oh if all men loved this most merciful Mother, and had recourse to her in the hour of temptation, we would seldom see any one lost, or suffer shipwreck.' We fall, and we are lost, when we fail to invoke her assistance. Saint Laurence Justinian applies to the blessed Virgin these words of Ecclesiasticus, 'I walked on the waves of the sea;' for he makes her say, 'I walk on the waves of the sea with my servants, in order to save them from a melancholy shipwreck.' S. Thomas Villanova says, 'When the birds of prey (meaning the devils) pounce on us, let us imitate the chickens, who when the hawk appears, fly for refuge under the wings of their Mother; let us

fly to Mary without losing a moment, and she will secure us in her maternal bosom. O Mary, continues the saint, addressing the Queen of heaven; it is for you to defend us, since you after God are our refuge, our protectress, our sweetest hope.' We shall conclude with the words of S. Bernard: 'Christian whoever thou art, thy life on earth is a perilous navigation: if thou dost not wish to be drowned, turn not away thy eyes from this brilliant star, look up at the star of mariners, invoke Mary in occasions of sin, in the struggle of temptation, in the midst of danger call Mary to thy aid; let her powerful name be ever in thy heart, and on thy lips, to inspire thee with confidence; trust in Mary, and thou wilt not fall into despair; follow her, and thou wilt not stray; let her hand protect thee, and thou wilt have nothing to fear; let her be thy guide, and thou wilt infallibly arrive at the haven of salvation. This do, and thou shalt live." (p. 69—71.) "The Church in her public service teaches us to recur to Mary under the titles of Health of the sick; Refuge of sinners; Help of Christians. In her offices for the festivals of Mary, she applies to her these words of Wisdom: 'In me is all hope of life and virtue;' again, 'he who finds me shall find life, and obtain salvation from the Lord: they who work in me shall have life everlasting.' Now what do all those texts go to prove, but that the intercession of Mary is necessary for us?"

Lastly, it should be noticed that there is an essential difference between the way in which men's salvation is in any passages of the fathers said to be derived through S. Mary, and that in which it is attributed to her by these later writers. The object of S. Irenæus[c] and other fathers, in the first place, is not to magnify S. Mary, but to point out the reality of the Incarnation, which was denied by the Gnostic heretics; but then, further, the benefits are said to be derived through her, in that, of her according to the flesh, Christ was born; in the later writers, they are attributed to her by virtue of the dignity, *since* bestowed upon her: in the fathers, they are spoken as coming from her indirectly, in later writers, directly; in the fathers, from her when on earth, in later writers from her in Heaven; in the fathers from the Nativity of our Lord, later, from *her* sovereignty, rule, Intercession, Command,

[c] "This comparison between Mary and Eve ('that the world is freed by [through] a Virgin, which before by a virgin [Eve] had fallen under sin,') in the same manner as Christ and Adam are compared, is so common among the older writers, that from S. Irenæus downwards, it would be easy to fill pages with quotations." Dr. Wiseman's remarks on Mr. Palmer's Letter, p. 24.

with which for her merits she is alleged to be invested. The expressions of the fathers do not go beyond St. Paul's words, "Adam was not deceived, but, the woman being deceived was in the transgression; notwithstanding, she shall be saved through the childbearing," as though the blessed fact that our Lord was "born of a woman" had some mysterious relation to the fall by a woman; that there is a correspondence between death coming through the transgression of the woman and life coming through her. In the "Glories of Mary" it is expressly denied that this is the sense in which the modern sayings should be taken.

"That God has constituted Mary the ordinary dispensatrix of His graces, was the opinion of St. Bernard: it is now the common opinion of all theologians, and all doctors. It is taught by Tega, Mendozza, Poire, Pacciuchelli, Segneri, Crasset, and a crowd of others. Even Father Noel Alexander, so reserved in his propositions, says, 'That God wishes that all the favours men expect from Him, they should be indebted for to the intercession of Mary.'"

"But this doctrine does not please a certain modern author: this person, who otherwise speaks with much piety and learning, of true and false devotion, is very parsimonious when there is question of the worship of the holy Virgin, refusing her that glory, and those privileges, which a St. Germanus, a St. Anselm, a St. John Damascene, St. Bonaventure, a St. Antonius, a St. Bernardine of Sienna, and innumerable other holy doctors, made no difficulty to grant her. He pretends that the aforesaid proposition, 'God confers no grace but through Mary's intercession,' is an hyperbole which fervour caused some saints to utter, and that it is only correct in this sense, that 'Mary has given to the world, Jesus the Author of grace;' for, adds he, 'the apostle formally teaches, that we acknowledge but One sole Mediator between God and man, viz. the Word made flesh." (p. 116, 7.)

It is for earnest-minded Romanists seriously to consider the tendency of all this; Faith is not holding truth in the abstract, it must penetrate the life and run through a man's whole belief; worldly-minded persons are often, in the whole habit of their mind, Socinians, although if asked they would acknowledge or think that they believed the Divinity and Atonement of our Lord; and persons may be practically worshippers of the Blessed Virgin only, while they would acknowledge in the abstract that she derives all her power from her Son. It ought probably to awaken

some fears in them that they habitually contemplate and speak of S. Mary as "the Mother of God" only, still speak of our Lord, in reference to her, as her Son only; there may be in this a subtle Humanitarianism, which, while they are encouraged to shrink from the thought of their Lord as their Judge, thinks of Him only as the Son of Mary, and while it acknowledges S. Mary as the Mother of God, practically forgets that He created her, and in that they hold her to have been without sin, denies that He redeemed her. The term "Mother of God" expresses Catholic truth; yet may it be, and it is, continually used by Romanists in an heretical sense.

While these things are so, although we did not separate from Rome, yet since God has permitted that Rome should separate us from her, we see not how the Anglican Church could re-unite with her, without betraying the trust which she owes to her own children.

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

A LETTER

TO HIS GRACE

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

ON SOME CIRCUMSTANCES

CONNECTED

WITH THE PRESENT CRISIS

IN THE

ENGLISH CHURCH.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1842.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

CONTENTS.

	Page
INTRODUCTION.	1
Present Importance of Episcopal Charges.	3
I. Tendency to Romanism not produced by the Tracts for the Times; its real causes.	8
II. Recent Charges of some of our Bishops. Their effects. Review of them, as far as relates to the "Tracts."	39
III. Bishopric of Jerusalem; wherein an object of sympathy; wherein of apprehension.	111
IV. Conclusion. Recent aggravation of our confusions. Need of peace, sympathy, guidance; anxiety of present crisis.	136
Additional Notes.	163

May it please your Grace,

In times of less difficulty, it would be presumption in one in my inferior office to address your Grace thus publicly, without any hint from yourself: when the storm is upon the vessel, they to whom its guidance is committed, listen patiently to any voice, however humble, telling of some peril, which, from their position, may not be equally obvious to themselves. The greatness of the emergency excuses the boldness which it calls forth. "Suggestions, made even by the vulgar crowd, have been often profitable to the most perfect gladiators," is Tertullian's excuse for addressing those who were then occupying the fore-front of the battle, and soon to be enrolled in the "noble army of martyrs." Yet even thus, I can assure your Grace that it is with deep reluctance, that I have again come forward at all; much more, thus publicly to address your Grace and through you our other fathers, the Bishops of our Church. The natural repugnance which any one must feel at taking upon himself a task to which he has no apparent call, must be aggravated by the difficulties with which every thing is now encompassed. It is a far happier office to listen than to speak. It is painful to do what (notwithstanding all one may say) may *seem* like offering advice, when one had much rather simply obey, and where I *do* wish merely

to furnish materials whereon you may exercise your own judgment; nor should I have done it, but for circumstances which I need not trouble your Grace by explaining. I quitted unwillingly occupations more congenial and more peaceful. Yet, though I have no title to address your Grace, your love of unity and peace, your anxiety for our Church, over which, by the grace of God, you preside, will dispose you to listen kindly to any thing, which may have for its object her peace and well-being; your condescending kindness, on different occasions, to myself makes it, I trust, less presumptuous in me to become the organ of offering it.

The ground then, upon which I am anxious to address your Grace is, (I may say at once,) my anxiety lest evil befal our Church, through an inadequate appreciation, on the part of those in authority, of the construction likely to be put upon what they do, and its effects. And in any thing which I may offer, I would wish to be considered rather as conveying information to your Grace as to those from whom your Grace's position necessarily separates you, than as venturing to offer suggestions as to the course which you may think it wise to pursue.

In the same way would I wish any observations to be understood which, in the course of this appeal, I may venture to make as to any thing, which I might wish had been otherwise, in any Charges of your Grace's brethren. I do not for a moment wish to criticise what they have said, in

itself: I wish only to remark upon some probable effects of things so said, which they probably do not anticipate. And this, in every relation and office of life, we wish to know. Things which it may be right to say, may tell upon persons of different temperaments and tones of mind very differently. A kind master wishes to elicit from his servant the effect of his words, when he has occasion to find fault; else he may mistake silence for obstinacy or unconcern; a loving parent watches the countenance of the child he is blaming, catches gladly at its half-uttered explanations, softens his rebuke and soothes, so soon as he is sure that the effect is attained; all in secular authority, who have in any degree to guide by influence, wish to know how they are understood. Your Grace and your Grace's brethren are, according to your ancient title, our "Fathers in God;" and you would assuredly be not less anxious to know the feelings of those under your authority severally, and collectively under that of the body of which your Lordships are the chief; nay, rather the more, in that what is at stake is of so much more moment, the censure so much more solemn, every thing said or done affects indirectly the whole body of Christ; all relates not to time but to eternity.

Then, also, the circumstances of the times have given to the Charges of our Bishops a character so different from that which they had heretofore, that I may anticipate that the Bishops themselves would accept the more gladly any information as to the

effects of them, which any might be enabled to offer. In quiet, one may say stagnant, times, such as until of late ours have been, a Bishop's Charge was listened to, one may say perhaps mostly delivered, with little interest; it was heard, perhaps read, in his particular Diocese; yet, unless for some incidental expression, but little noticed out of it, and then perhaps criticised rather than heeded. The Bishops themselves did not seem to expect much weight to be attached to their words; when they did rebuke, they expected to have persons of a refractory temper to deal with, and their words were sharp accordingly. Now, both within and without, things are widely different. The change of feeling with regard to the office of every one's own Bishop, wrought by more reverent habits, and increased appreciation of the feelings of Antiquity, gives their words a weight, of which they themselves are not aware: the relation in which they stand makes, as one of us feelingly said, "the slightest word of censure from one's own Bishop a heavy thing;" the very willingness to obey, the reverence and affection which we feel and would gladly testify, aggravate the weight of every thing which they pronounce against us, even as an affectionate child is more wounded by a look from its parent, than another by sharp rebuke or even blows. On the other hand, the intensity of the interest of the questions now at issue gives to every expression falling from your Lordships, weight and circulation among persons, who ordinarily would have thought too little either of your words or your office, at all

events would have been out of the reach of theological discussion, for which they are little prepared, and which they now often enter upon injuriously. It may be among the manifold workings of God's Providence for our Church, that He has thus ordered that the interest of all should, in one way or other, be absorbed into these mighty questions. They have penetrated into our villages; they are the household talk of those who aforetime, alas! never spoke or thought perhaps of the things of God: all expect something, are on the look-out for something; that so the Truth of God may every where find its own; the good seed be carried, and root it in the clefts of the rocks, which it had never found, had not they who knew it not, dropped it unconsciously; all are somehow stirred and becoming alive to what is going on in the Church, that in every rank and sex and age they who may be won, may in this general preparation for His Coming take their allotted parts, await Him, live to Him.

And thus it happens, that every word of your Lordships, in the high office assigned to you, is watched and has a degree of weight given to it, proportioned to men's interest in the whole subject; they who at other times would slightly regard your words, now watch every syllable; they who would little regard them, if addressed to themselves, seize them eagerly as a weapon against others; they give them, I have reason to know, oftentimes a force which in themselves they were not intended to have; they who would take no other interest in

them, use them now like moves in a mighty game, whereby they hope to obtain an advantageous position against those whom they oppose; every word of censure or of warning is not taken as an insulated admonition in a particular case, but is made to bear upon the whole question; it is a critical struggle for life or death; and so, not a sound can be uttered, which penetrates not the whole frame; every thing is strung up, and so every touch, sound, breath, motion, vibrates through the whole.

This, I think, some of your Grace's brethren have not, and, in the nature of things could not beforehand realize; I have reason to know that one was recently surprised at the weight attached to his own words; this must be the case, in some measure, with all in authority; and the more, by how much more that authority is of a delicate and spiritual nature; our words,—as indeed the very word of God Himself, Whose word rebuke also is,—have weight according to the temper of mind of those they reach: but especially in a crisis like the present, in which the interest, month by month, becomes more extensive, pervading, intense, they who have passed most of their years in tranquil times, may well not be able to appreciate beforehand, what can indeed be adequately calculated by none. We are indeed altogether so little able to realize what we are; that there may be no chance word or slight action of ours but may have its influence; that a half-unconscious look or un-

weighed expression may leave a lasting impression on another's soul. And now every thing is new and on a new scale, and former measures will not apply to these times.

If then I express a wish that some of the language concerning part of our teaching had been in any respect different, it is because I am convinced that could the Bishops have foreseen its effects, they would themselves have modified it; nor yet do I write, as wishing that they should change what they have done, but rather in the hope that they who may hereafter speak, will speak, as in fuller possession of the manifold bearings of what they have to deliver. Recent circumstances present also a more immediate apology for thus venturing to allude to these Charges; for since others[a] have founded upon them an appeal to your Grace to "take such measures as may seem most advisable, for the Episcopal Bench to declare their united disapprobation of the opinions of the writers of the Tracts," it is natural for me to desire to shew that those Charges furnish no ground for any such measures, and to express my regret that the Charges of Bishops, who wished to warn, not to condemn, should yet have given such encouragement to those who would fain exclude us from our Church herself.

I. But before I enter upon the main subject to which I wish to entreat your Grace's attention, there is yet

[a] Address of certain Lay Inhabitants of Cheltenham. The example, I understand, has been followed in other places.

another point upon which it seems a duty to speak distinctly, however reluctant I may be, lest harm incidentally result, or I seem undutiful. Yet unless we know the true nature of our evils, we cannot apply their remedies; and so it seems to me very important that your Lordships should have a distinct view upon it, while yet I know that it is one upon which it is most difficult for those of elder years fully to understand the present state of things. That subject is the temptation to young or susceptible minds to forsake our own Communion for that of Rome. Your Grace will not think that in writing on this subject, I have forgotten what I have myself recently[b] said, as to the evils in the Roman Communion which should deter any from joining it, or the tokens of God's Providence which should bind us to our own Church, or the affection with which we should love her. But here I wish to speak on one subject only; the real, actual, temptations, to which *in the present state of things* a certain class of minds is exposed: and in that I say, "the present state of things," I mean that they are not inherent in our Church, but incidental only to her *present* condition; in that I speak of "temptations," I imply that it would be sinful to yield to them. Yet all would wish to know the temptations to which their children were exposed, and so your Lordships, as to your "children in the faith." In this case it is the more necessary to speak, on account of the difficulty of appreciating temptations

[b] Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 159 sqq. and Appendix.

to which any have not been exposed, or to whose workings they have not been called upon to minister. Even those of my own age, who have been brought more into contact with Romanism as a living system than your Lordships, have not had the difficulties, which will beset many younger men; we have been brought on our way past middle life, and may the rather look to close it as we have begun; we have grown up thus long in our Church, and have, in such points as from circumstances are less distinct in her, gradually filled up her teaching to ourselves, by the teaching of the Church Catholic, of which she is the representative to us, and to which she directs her members; our insight into her teaching and Catholic truth grew together; we became more fully acquainted with both at once, and so they the rather harmonized in our minds. Our immediate Mother was our guide to "the Mother of us all." Romanism, in our earlier days, was scarcely heard of among us, and so we learnt Catholicity, partly as it had been handed down to us, partly from the study of Primitive Antiquity, not in contact with a system in which one must mourn that tares are mingled with the good seed. Romanism was, in our early associations, an antagonist principle; what is Catholic and true in it, we learnt, whence it is derived, from the primitive sources; of itself we thought, only for that which is peculiar to it, as distinct from Catholic Antiquity, the error mingled with the truth. It was apparently at a low ebb, and partook of the general listlessness

which crept over the Church during the last century; it seemed to present but the skeleton of the right practices which it retained, and helped by its neglect of their spirit to cast reproach upon them; the writer of a work then popular[b] could even speak of it as extinct among us. It is not so now. The Roman Church also has, in some countries certainly, partaken of the same refreshing dew as ourselves; the same Hand, which has touched us, and bid our sleeping Church, "Awake, arise," has reached her also; our Lord seems to be awakening the several portions of His Church, and even those bodies which have not yet the organization of a Church, at once; it may be, that we may all together learn humility, and none boast herself, amid her imperfections, or think unhumbly of them, when she sees the like grace given to others, whose imperfections, as not being her own, she has no difficulty in descrying. However, whatever momentary difficulties it may give rise to, we must acknowledge thankfully that in England the Roman Communion has, amidst its sad errors from which it will not part, a degree of life and holiness which in our earlier days it had not. And this perhaps not least through an infusion of members of our own, who, in better times, would have remained, blessed and a blessing within her. She has now for many years exhibited her peculiar system in a modified form, the most calculated to win those who know not the treasures stored up for them in their own

[b] Father Clement.

Church. She stands too often in advantageous contrast, not with our Church as she would be, did we realize her gifts and avail ourselves of the privileges lodged in her, but with her condition, such as, through our sins and negligences, she has mostly become; and out of which she is beginning to be restored. The temptation comes not to those formed in the holy round of her daily devotions, and humbled by her tones of penitence, but to those, who through our carelessness have been unformed, untrained, uninstructed; or at least, are unacquainted with her true principles, the grounds of her claims, the virtue imparted through her. And to these the Roman Communion, as at present seen in this country, does come in a fascinating and imposing form[c]. She comes to us with our common saints, which modern habits have led many wrongly to regard as hers exclusively; with holy truths and practices, which in our recent carelessness are too often disregarded or neglected, or even spoken against amongst ourselves; with unity on truths, whereon we are distracted, (although, alas! upon doctrines and practices also which are not true nor holy;) with discipline, which we should find useful for ourselves, and which has been neglected among us; with fuller devotions[d], works of practical wisdom or of purified

[c] The following is not an ideal picture of what is calculated to influence; it is a statement of what I know to have influenced persons, and to be felt. I do not then suggest temptations, but state what exist. Temptations are to be remedied, not by denying their existence, but by a more vivid consciousness of duty.

[d] "There is so much of excellence and beauty in the services of

and kindled love[e]; a ritual, which (though withdrawn mostly from the laity,) still in itself at some holy seasons sets before the eyes more prominently than our own, our Saviour in His Life and Death for His Church, or which utters more distinctly some truths, which the sins of the Church caused to be more veiled among ourselves: or she points to a Communion of Saints, in which we profess our belief, but of which little is heard among us, now that even the prayer for the Church Militant for the most part, practically forms no part of our weekly service; she has, in her Monastic institutions, a refuge from the weariness and vanities of the world and a means of higher perfection to individuals, which many sigh after, and which might be revived in a primitive form, but which as yet we have not; in her small Communion in this country, she is not pressed on all sides by the spiritual wants of her children as we are, which hinder perhaps from noble enterprise in God's service, some who might otherwise have essayed it, still she does erect among us edifices to His glory, with which, notwithstanding the ample means at the command of

the Breviary, that were it skilfully set before the Protestant by Roman controversialists as the book of devotions received in their communion, it would undoubtedly raise a prejudice in their favour, if he were ignorant of the circumstances of the case, and but ordinarily candid and unprejudiced. To meet this danger is one principal object of the following pages." Tract 75. init.

[e] The use of French Roman Catholic books, in which the un-Catholic portion is very subordinate, has been one very frequent way of enlisting the sympathies of members of our Church, especially females.

our people, we have but a little, here and there, in this day to compare. Above all, she comes to us with her prayers; and some of her members by remembering us at the Altar, and night and day in the Holy Week, have drawn men's hearts unto them and won our sympathy and gratitude, in any lawful way wherein we may manifest it.

In all this, it is cause of thankfulness to see that there is nothing which ought to shake the stedfastness of a well-balanced and humble mind. Our duty is "heartily to thank our Heavenly Father for the state of salvation into which He brought us," when by Baptism He made us at once members of His Son and our Church, became Himself our Father, and gave us our Church for our Mother. Our plain duty is, "wherein we have been called, there to abide with Him;" it is not for us to imagine, (as is people's continued temptation in every line and part of life,) that we should have easier duties and greater privileges, under circumstances in which God has not placed us; it is, to be thankful and live up to our own, and pray that through our neglect or misuse they turn not to our condemnation. Were it even true that the Roman Communion did possess greater advantages than our own, this would be no practical question to us individually. It may be that one end which Almighty God has in exhibiting the Roman Church in this form among us, is to dispose us as a Church to more kindly feelings towards her, and to have a less overweening opinion of our-

selves than we have mostly been wont to cherish. But individually it cannot change our duties. Our duties are positive and unconditional; they lie towards our Mother, the English Church, because God has assigned us our lot in her, and are irrespective of any thing without her. The duties and blessings of "the first commandment with promise" are in obedience to our Parent as such. Our duties are to her, because through her we were reborn, within her have we been trained, catechized, instructed, guarded, guided, called, recalled; in her words and in her Courts we have worshipped from childhood until now; in her we have had all our "means of grace," in her we have whatever be our "hopes of glory;" at her breasts our Heavenly Father "nourished and brought us up[a]," as "children," and to forsake her would be to "rebel against" Him; through her He fed us, when young, with milk, in her He feeds us now with Angels' food, the Bread of Heaven; in her He has given us what out of her we could not have had;—I need but allude to One precious Gift, whose value none can estimate, bestowed on us alone in the whole Western Church, and which I cannot understand how any Communicant who loves his Lord, could of his own act forego. One would not speak of persons in those Churches which refuse the Cup to their members; sore as the loss is, God can make up to His own, any losses which they sustain where He has placed them; but for

[a] Isai. i.

one who has had that privilege bestowed upon him, voluntarily to forsake the Communion wherein God has given it him, it does seem such a wilful rejection of the gift of his Saviour's Blood, as, in any who knew what that Gift is, one should dread to think of. And even besides this sad forfeiture, for any one, who, placed within a Church, has experienced God's guidance and the operation of His Holy Spirit on his heart, to forsake the Church, wherein God dealt so graciously with him, and shewed His merciful care for his soul—it does seem so ungrateful a disavowal of God's past mercies to him, such a cutting-off of all his past existence as a member of Christ's Church, as to make it very painful to think of those, who having been placed within our Church are being tempted to forsake, or have forsaken her who has the Apostolic Succession in this land.

But beyond these positive obligations, even in those things which in the Roman Communion are at first sight so attractive, what is Catholic and un-Catholic are so strangely blended together, that to any well-instructed mind, they create the longing to "re-appropriate[b]" what is Catholic, not to join a Communion, (itself, in this country, schismatic, and acting in a very unhumble and schismatic spirit,) where it is to be found only with what is un-Catholic. Throughout all she has of excellent, there is spread (to mention no more) that one corrupting leaven, the joining of the creature with the Creator, setting

[b] Tract 75, p. 1.

forth another object of affection, "giving His glory to another," teaching both saint and sinner to rely upon the Blessed Virgin as on Him [a]. This one addition, in itself, mars her books of devotion, her daily services, her Monastic institutions (which are in part instituted to promote it). One might add one error in practice,—withdrawal of privileges from her people; so that her Eucharists are to the majority mostly but to see the Heaven they partake not of, her daily devotions are no where given to the people, her most solemn service, that of the Holy Communion, seldom, but a modern service virtually substituted for it [b]. They speak of our service as

[a] To the sinner, as the refuge to whom he may most safely have recourse, as having the peculiar charge of "her goats," (all sinners who trust in her) as our Blessed Lord of the sheep, (Glories of Mary, p. 153, 4.); to the Saint, as obtaining for him that last crowning gift, perseverance to the end. The grace of perseverance is, in the received system, accounted to be specially obtained by S. Mary; so that books, which have little else of the distinctive Romanist system, still teach to seek this at her hands. Thus this system proposes S. Mary as the immediate source of hope, from first to last,—of conversion to the hardened sinner, who has no other grace but love for her, (Glories of Mary, p. 40, 54—7, 90. quoted Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 213. Man's only affair, p. 150 see Irish Eccl. Journal, No. 177.) and for the saint who needs no other grace but to persevere to the end. The evidence on both heads might be multiplied indefinitely. How different the teaching from that of the Catholic Church, as in S. Augustine de Dono Perseverantiæ.

[b] The most frequent way of "hearing Mass," as it is called, is to substitute other prayers to be used by the laity, while those in Latin are being recited, unheard, by the Priest. These are provided in different authorized books of devotion, so that many distinct Liturgies (so to say) are being recited at the same time;

diminished, (and in parts it is,) yet at least it is more than is given to their people. What we have (and it is very much) we have purely, and for all, for Christ's little ones, His lambs; what we have not, is being daily restored to us, if we in patience wait for it; and for the mean time, the humble-minded will feel that all which is withheld from us, is kept back in mercy to us, that what we have is best suited to us [b]. Such an Angel-life does daily Communion imply, that we may well think that it is too high a gift for the degenerate Church of these last days, as even the Roman Communion tacitly acknowledges, in that except for the Priesthood, she has herself disused it [c]; would one could think that

the modern mostly very inferior, and the ancient service virtually lost.

[b] To develope this is the object of Tract 86, "On the superintending Providence of God in the alteration of the English Liturgy." To some humble minds, who have ever enjoyed our beautiful and Catholic Liturgy, it will be painful even to hear it spoken of, as though we had lost any thing; yet we must "bear patiently each other's burdens;" and this Tract has been very chastening and sobering to many, who were inclined to mourn that foreign Reformers had been allowed an influence over it, and caused some things to be parted with, which we see to be in themselves a loss.

[c] Prayers even of the Missal are altered in the modern translations, to adapt them to a state of things in which the holy Mysteries are "witnessed" not "partaken of." In some places grave change of doctrine is thus introduced; as "May the mysteries we have *witnessed* purify us; and grant that this Sacrament [unreceived] may not increase our guilt, but be a means of obtaining pardon, &c. Let not the participation of Thy Body—which I, though unworthy, presume (*spiritually*) to receive, turn to my condemnation." (Catholic Hours, p. 96, 113.)

in different countries, it were a blessing even to them! As we grow in holiness, our present privileges will deepen to us, and we shall be fitter to receive whatever besides the Primitive Church had. Our blessings are, day by day, being enlarged; and He Who in mercy is teaching us to value and revive what we have, will, when it is good for us, restore what is yet "lacking [c]."

We may well be thankful that God has assigned us our lot in a "goodly heritage," wherein we are free from the temptation to substitute other objects of love or veneration for The Object Who is to fill the mind for eternity; wherein we are taught to "come boldly to the throne of grace," not seek another mediator, through whom to approach our Lord. We have or may obtain to ourselves when we will, every thing which is Catholic in the whole Church; our Liturgy has deep devotion, and is free from every thing un-Catholic. We may well shrink from parting with "the inheritance of our fathers," for its own sake, even if it could be done without sin. The path of duty is clear to humble and dutiful minds, who have ever been trained in the old ways; there are marks enough, we doubt not, for all, in the end, who in patience and self-discipline wish to know God's will that they may

[c] Bp. Andrews, Devotions, The second Day, "for the British, the supply of what is wanting in it, the strengthening of what remains in it." First Day, "Thou who walkest amid the golden candlesticks, remove not our candlestick out of its place. Supply what are wanting, strengthen what remains, which Thou art ready to cast away, which are ready to die."

do it. I am speaking only of temptation; what upon certain frames of mind would act as a trial, though to be overcome; but it is necessary to appreciate that there are temptations and trials; that the wish in individuals to be joined to the Roman Church, does not necessarily arise in undutifulness to our own, although one may generally trace some one wrong temper, at least, in those who have forsaken our Church for it.

And while there are these real attractions towards the Roman Church, (however more than counterbalanced in well-disciplined and humble hearts,) we must admit that there are also real difficulties in the position of our Church, which must be felt more keenly, as people realize more the doctrine of the Unity of the Church;—what our Lord intended that it should be, what it for a long time was. Not of course that these difficulties should overwhelm us; but they are hard trials to many, and must be accounted such, and borne patiently as trials. And in these again we ourselves have been exempt from the degree of trial to which a younger generation is exposed, through the very gradualness with which our conceptions of the Unity of the Church came upon us. There was in our younger days no visible Church, to which to attach ourselves, except our own. The Roman communion had in this country but her few scattered sheep, who had adhered to her since the times of Q. Elizabeth; she was herself asleep, and scarcely

maintained herself, much less was such as to attract others. We were not tempted then to look for any thing but that invisible Unity, which we trust all the now-severed Communions have in their One Head, in Whom they all live, from Whom, though torn among themselves, we trust they are not rent. We dwelt alone, our island-situation a type of our Church, and were content, because there seemed no opening for any thing beyond. We were scarcely aware that we were rejected by the Western Church, not formally acknowledged by the Eastern, because we were locally separated from both. Girt round in our home, and living among ourselves, we felt not that we were regarded as aliens by those we saw not. We felt that we had, as we have, the Unity of the Faith, confessing to our God the one Creed—in our pious Bishop Ken's words, "the Faith of the Universal Church, before East and West were divided;" that we have the Unity of common descent from the Church which was one; we are one in one common parent, even if actual communion is suspended; one in the Communion of saints with the Church in Paradise, far larger and holier than that below; we have "one hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all;" through His Sacraments we "have been all made to drink into One Spirit," and so we the more acquiesced that we were one body, though some members of that body said to us, "We have no need of thee." But it is otherwise

now; the Roman Communion is now every where among us, and we must feel that, if they could, they would cut us off; it is brought home to us that, from whatever causes, partly the sin of that first great schism of East and West, over which we had no control, partly through acts (whether they could be avoided or no) of our own Church, we are, as to actual Communion, separated from the rest of the Christian family; we feel ourselves in a maimed condition; our relation to other branches of the Church is different from any heretofore. There is no precedent in holier ages, either in favour of the larger branches of the Western Church, or of ourselves; none for such occasion of a single Church reforming itself, without consent of the whole [d], none for the larger Branch needing some such reformation and refusing it; rejecting one branch, and imposing un-Catholic conditions on its re-union. According as people contemplate the one side or

[d] The line, however, pursued by the African Church, under the guidance both of S. Cyprian and S. Augustine, goes as far to establish such a precedent, as can be furnished by primitive times, when no general reformation was needed. The case of S. Cyprian and the African Synods in maintaining the invalidity of Schismatical Baptism against the Bishop of Rome, is the stronger, because their view was not confirmed by the Church subsequently; the Bishop of Rome rejected their Communion, as he has ours; yet S. Augustine, while abandoning the practice of S. Cyprian, maintains against the Donatists, that he was not guilty of schism. In the case of Pelagius, the African Synods maintained their ground against Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, who acquitted him and severely censured them, and they obtained a confirmation of their sentence from the Emperor, to which Zosimus yielded.

the other, they will feel most vividly the fact or its excuse, and blame Rome for obstinacy, or ourselves for precipitancy; and since we have perhaps unduly held ourselves free from all blame, so the re-action is, that some are inclined to look on that alone which in us was blameworthy. Yet, besides the plea of necessity, the very unhappiness of the Church is our excuse. We did no act opposed to the Universal Church. There is now no orbis terrarum, over against which we stand; none which has rejected or condemned us. Since the Greek Church, and her ninety million, is severed from what claims to be *the* Catholic Church, and yet has life, so may we; and by the mercy of our God, we feel that we have it. It is a fact, that entire visible unity is not vouchsafed to the Church of these last days, and so, until God be pleased to amend it, we may rest contented in our lot. Yet the very fact that we have to be contented, shews that we have trials; our people go abroad, and find no home there; they see Churches, some flourishing, though some decayed, which, at best, own us but doubtingly; there is Christian life, from which we are excluded; the Church, the common home of all, is, out of the space occupied by our sister or daughter Churches, no home for us; they return to us, and feel that we are solitary. Then comes Rome among us, and,—rejecting the Greek Church of whose extent, as not being brought into intercourse with it, people are not aware, and so acquiesce in the excision of nearly half the

Christian Name as a light thing,—declares herself *the* Church[e], and offers to relieve our difficulties, and give vent to our sympathies, by placing us in

[e] This is the ground on which Mr. Sibthorp justifies his recent secession. He writes, as if unconscious of the existence of the Greek Church, as though the question were only between Protestants (with whom he has already learnt to identify the Church he has forsaken) and the Roman Church. In studying the types of the Old Testament he found the unity of the Church prominent, in a degree in which it is not in this day fulfilled, unless the Roman Communion be "*the* Church," and therefore he joined it. He unhappily overlooked that prophecy even more distinctly foretells "holiness" as a characteristic of the Church, in a degree in which it is still less fulfilled in the Church any where now. The same degeneracy of the Church forfeited both. Each is probably a condition of the other. Diminished holiness caused the misunderstandings and strife and ambition, which ended in the schism of the East and West; our schisms probably aid to perpetuate the unholiness which produced them. Life and desire of union are being reawakened together; increasing life will be accompanied doubtless with increasing love. But until the Church of Rome fulfils the ideal of holiness, set forth in prophecy, it cannot claim our obedience, on the ground that the ideal of unity, also set forth in prophecy, is not fulfilled unless she exclusively be *the* Church. If the sins of the Church have forfeited the one, they may also the other. It is a sad, but admitted, fact, that the Church of these days does fall short of the descriptions of prophecy. (see Mr. Newman on Romanism and Popular Protestantism, Lect. 8. Indefectibility of the Church Catholic, p. 231 sqq. who quotes also Leslie, Works, iii. p. 25—28.) The argument on which Mr. Sibthorp justifies his secession to Romanism, is the same in principle, as that on which the Donatists and many modern sects justify their schisms. They urged the non-fulfilment of the note of Holiness, as Mr. S. that of Unity. If holiness, the very end of the dispensation of the Gospel, may be imperfect, and the word of Scripture not be broken, much more may Unity. If the claims of the Donatists are not valid, neither are those of Rome.

communion with herself, the largest portion of the Christian world. And, since the desire of union is a right one, it is, when thus presented, a temptation, real, though to be resisted. We have, ever since we were thus severed, been feeling again after union; and this longing after it, although we could not attain it, may be a proof the more that we are a living, though torn, member of the one body. What is cut off has no feeling. It is, while the wounded limb still hangs on to the body from which it is disjointed, that it has pain. Sects have none. They boast themselves in their separation. Montanists or Donatists rejected the Church as carnal, and set themselves up as *the* one pure Church in its stead. *We* have ever missed more or less what we have lost, and have been yearning after the visible unity and intercommunion which we have not. Our very errors have been in part owing to it: we mixed ourselves up at the first with foreign reformations, and impaired our formularies, with a view to it; since then, our negociations with the Gallican Church, with Prussia formerly, with the Eastern Church, bear witness to our longings; at the beginning of this century, when wars kept us apart from other nations, and Church principles were less understood, this desire of union shewed itself in the very rejection of all true principles of union. Having no visible unity, people substituted an invisible; and not only so, which might have been right, but they sought to make a visible unity for themselves, by disparaging that of

the Church, by sympathizing and associating with those who had forsaken her, and becoming like them. The same longing which some years past brought very many to the verge of Dissent, and often carried them into it, is now setting in towards Churches, and is a sore temptation to many to forsake their Church for Rome.

But, besides this, which is not our own fault but our unhappiness, over which we have no control, but for whose mitigation or removal we must in patience wait, it must be owned, my Lord, that we have other difficulties which are our fault, or rather that one difficulty, from which all others flow. Had we that holiness, which should mark us out visibly as a true living branch of "the Holy Church," all other difficulties would vanish. Now, we have, we trust, the rudiments of every thing, but nothing developed, so that it should at once be "manifest" to all, "that God is in us of a truth." "Whence come wars and fightings among you?" may the Apostle well ask us. These manifold divisions among ourselves, contending upon points which they on one side at least state to be fundamental, though *we* hope *they* believe better than they often speak; this bandying about of the name of heresy, and that, applied to holy truth, even the gift of our Lord to us in Baptism; this "casting out the names" of brethren "as evil;" this impossibility of understanding each other or making ourselves understood; alas! it is more like the con-

fusion of Babel, when God hindered them from building the city, than that "city, which is at unity in itself," in which it was promised that there should be "one speech and one language." Our laity *thus far* have no living guide; "the lips of the priest" do not, *thus far*, "teach knowledge," for them; for persons, whom they alike respect, teach them differently, and one of the two great classes of teachers tells them often that the other is in fatal error. Those whom God endues with patience abide calmly, and in the Catholic teaching of the Prayer Book, wrought into their minds by habitual devotion, find that stay and guidance which the living Church should give; yet can one be surprised that our poor frail nature is fretted often, instead of being humbled, by what is so unseemly; that persons have difficulty in recognising a Church so disturbed, as the representative of her who is "the pillar and ground of the truth;" that they should seek to escape this strife, by going over where they will find one who undertakes to guide them, allows them to surrender a judgment which they know not how to exercise, and to have peace?

And in the comparison, which those thus tempted institute, our Church has this disadvantage, that our own evils are close at hand, open, plain to day. Those of the Roman Communion, in many cases, are veiled; ours every where come to the surface; the too sadly attested infidelity in southern Europe and France, might well more than

counterbalance our dissensions or the imperfect belief of many; the superstition, or undue reverence, substituting the love of the creature for the Creator, too often found in foreign sermons in France, Portugal, or at Rome, might well outweigh any defects in our own; the violence whereby on the very Lord's Day, the passions of the people are in Ireland worked up by the Ministers of peace[f], and the obnoxious denounced from the Altar, might make the sad language against brethren or Churches, heard from time to time in our pulpits[g], seem a lesser evil; but their evils are less felt, because unseen, at a distance, unrealized, ours gall us, because they are our own.

Then, as to life. Our Church has indeed great difficulties, because it has an unruly, commercial, luxurious, unrefined, people to deal with. Antioch was, probably, of old in the most unfavourable

[f] The political meetings, at which so much inflammatory language is used by the Priests, are held mostly on the Sunday Evening.

[g] This has been a means of alienating people's minds to a degree in which they who use it, would themselves regret. If people are continually called Romanists, some will at length believe it of themselves. In a recent case, one, who would have been well contented to abide in the teaching of the Church, being told that she was a Romanist, and might as well join them openly, did so. To others, the question becomes very distressing, "How can I hold these high doctrines in my Church, who, they tell me, condemns them?" But, besides this, such language indisposes persons towards those who use it, frets them, and makes them sympathize even unduly with those against whom it is used.

position of all Churches, and we in many points too much resemble her. We must not visit upon our Church our national faults; but self-love blinds us to our own, makes us acute in seeing those of others. And so our Church bears the blame, if during the week, our churches stand empty, while foreign churches in the Roman Communion are full; and we her ministers are in part guilty, that fasts and festivals have been so entirely, and still are, neglected, that the daily service is but just struggling into use, that our Communions are so rare, our communicants so few, almsgiving so cold, luxury so rife, the very standard of our lower population as to one most debasing sin so miserably low, our sense of responsibility so little acute, the Presence of God so little habitually realized. Alas! my Lord, one need not go on with the sad catalogue; while we thankfully acknowledge that our Church has been an inestimable blessing to ourselves and to our people, and is capable of being far more so, did we carry out her provisions, and that the fault lies with us not with her, and that it will become otherwise when we in earnest wish it, we must confess that she does not in such degree possess the note of holiness, as at once and without all doubt to allay people's misgivings about her Apostolic character.

I have ventured to make this statement of some prominent difficulties, because, unless your Grace's brethren become more aware that there are real

difficulties, they cannot meet them; one would rather fear that what they do, will be in a wrong direction. It is easy and not unnatural to ascribe the tendency to Romanism, which has of late burst upon us, to the influence of Tracts, which by those opposed to them have been accused of that leaning; but it would be a shallow and untrue account of the matter. We would not shrink from any blame which any of us may deserve; but when there is a general stirring, as there now is, through the whole of Christendom, it would be a superficial view of it to trace the workings in any part of the Church to any particular set of men or writings; we [a] did not set the tide in motion, by which we have been ourselves carried onward; we have felt that there is a higher Hand than ours, which has raised the waters and ruleth them; we are but one slight item in the vast sum, one link in the chain of causes and effects whereby He is working for His Church what He willeth.

It is important to appreciate this, my Lord, because if this movement were the work of our hands or the effect of any writings of any man, it might seem

[a] The use of this word having been misunderstood in my "Letter to the Bishop of Oxford," as though it recognised the existence of a party, it may be said, that here, as there, it is used simply as a compendious term for those who are attacked in common, for maintaining the principles of the Church. It is indeed not the least remarkable circumstance in the present restoration of our Church, how little of the character of a party attaches to those who have concurred in it.

capable of being stayed by the same means which produced it. It might suffice to warn against the tendency of writings which had called it forth. But now since even he who has been God's chief instrument has always insisted how little is his share; since every thing, good or evil, has contributed to it; poetry, arts, architecture, morals, Christian or Heathen, novels, music, painting, have either prepared for it, or, being subsequently absorbed into it, have swelled its progress; our renewed intercourse with foreign Churches and still more the evils aimed at our own, the suppression of our Bishoprics, the assaults of dissent, the coldness of adherents, the anger of enemies, the lukewarmness or hostility of the state, strength or weakness, loss or gain, the traditionary system, existing in our Church, though too often a dead letter, or the religious earnestness and life, though most opposed to that system, and, in its defects, to the truth itself—every thing deep, every thing real, every thing holy, deeds of charity, kindliness, severity, every temperament and habit of mind even the most unlikely, the most remote, or the most adverse, liberalism or sceptical tendencies, have alike ministered to it, it is plain that He Alone can have set it in motion Who Alone has all things at His command, and maketh every thing work together to accomplish His will. The tendency to Romanism, itself but one phenomenon in the manifold workings

of this eventful day, is, as a whole, but a fruit of the deep yearning of the stirred Church to be again what her Saviour left her, One. Our severed members are being drawn to ourselves, as a Church, and knit into one in us ; as a Church, we are being drawn to other Churches, that, in God's good time, the whole body may be knit together under its One Head. Any deep view of the Church as one whole, must create a longing to realize what, as in vision, it beholds. Our severed state is a maimed and imperfect condition, checking, we must fear, the full flow of That Holy Spirit through our disjointed portions, Which, when perfectly present, makes what He pervades wholly one, even as He is the Unity of the Father and the Son. To feel what the Church should be, is to long that it be so. And if we come not with subdued hearts, settled to wait God's time for His gift, and anxious to take no step but just where He leads, there must be risk that persons will seek unity in unallowed ways of their own, and, as formerly with Dissent, so now in that communion which embraces the largest portion of Christendom, and which, in relationship as well as place, is nearest to us. This longing must be directed ; it cannot, ought not to, be quenched ; yet while it is active, (not to speak of other agents,) it were idle to think that any censure or silencing of men or books can stay what is the result of implanted sympathies, at the very centre of Christian life and love.

It may also be a relief to your Grace to know—it has come as a great relief to my own mind, since of late I have known it—that this confusion in which we now are, was not unforeseen. I mean not that it may not have been aggravated by any want of wisdom in myself or others; still it was anticipated as the necessary consequence of the restoration of the doctrines, which we have been employed to restore, before any of us were thought of as likely to be the instruments, or we ourselves had begun to look forward to the work, which has since been laid upon us. It will doubtless be refreshing to your Grace to see the words of one[f], whom in his inferior office, and as a Divine, you must have valued, how with the oracular prescience given to aged piety, when, as about to pass from this world, it receives, from time to time, a Divine insight into the things of that into which it is entering, he delineated in outline strangely faithful, the very form and order of things which were to be after his departure, but of which there were yet no signs. We may well be reconciled to troubles, which were thus marked out to us beforehand, as what we must necessarily pass through. And while we are thus content to bear them, and to be stigmatized as the causers of them and the "troublers of Israel[g]," they who are set

[f] Rev. T. Sikes, of Guilsborough, author of "Parochial Communion."

[g] 1 Kings xviii. 17.

over us may perhaps be the rather encouraged to bear their share cheerfully, and not be grieved at us, as if we alone by our errors caused, what, independently of us, it was foreseen would be. He, to whom the conversation was addressed, tells me, "I well remember the very countenance, gesture, attitude, and tone of good Mr Sikes, and give you, as near as may be, what he said."

"I seem to think, I can tell you something, which you who are young may probably live to see, but which I, who shall soon be called away off the stage, shall not. Wherever I go all about the country, I see amongst the Clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest, and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching: the uniform suppression of one great truth. There is no account given any where, so far as I see, of the one Holy Catholic Church. I think that the causes of this suppression have been mainly two. The Church has been kept out of sight, partly in consequence of the civil establishment of the branch of it which is in this country, and partly out of false charity to Dissent. Now this great truth is an article of the Creed; and if so, to teach the rest of the Creed to its exclusion must be to destroy "the analogy or proportion of the faith," τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πιστέως. This cannot be done, without the most serious consequences. The doctrine is of the last importance; and the principles it involves, of immense power; and some day, not far distant, it will judicially have its reprisals. And whereas the other articles of the Creed seem now to have thrown it into the shade, it will seem, when it is brought forward, to swallow up the rest. We now hear not a breath about the Church; by and bye, those who live to see it, will hear of nothing else; and, just in proportion perhaps to its present sup-

pression, will be its future developement. Our confusion now-a-days is chiefly owing to the want of it; and there will be yet more confusion attending its revival. The effects of it I even dread to contemplate, especially if it come suddenly. And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward. It ought especially of all others to be matter of catechetical teaching and training. The doctrine of the Church Catholic and the privileges of Church-membership cannot be explained from pulpits; and those who will have to explain it will hardly know where they are, or which way they are to turn themselves. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of Popery, from one end of the country to the other. It will be thrust upon minds unprepared, and on an uncatechized Church. Some will take it up and admire as a beautiful picture; others will be frightened and run away and reject it; and all will want a guidance which one hardly knows where they shall find. How the doctrine may be first thrown forward we know not; but the powers of the world may any day turn their backs upon us, and this will probably lead to those effects I have described."

I would not weaken these solemn words by any thing of my own; but, my Lord, if it was foreseen that they who had our office laid upon them, would be "endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted," that "there would be one great cry of Popery from one end of the country to the other," that they would have an office of trouble and "woe," that some would "be frightened and reject it," your Grace's brethren may perhaps the rather think that some of the things laid to our charge are founded on misunderstanding: if it was foreseen

that it would be "taken up and admired as a beautiful picture," it will seem less strange, if some having done so, have fallen.

Yet, as a fact, I may mention, that both such as have actually gone over to Rome, and such as have been endangered yet retained, and those for whom one has immediate fears, have not been, for the most part, persons formed by any of us or by our writings. Those who have gone over, have been mostly persons, not at all instructed in the character of our Church, who sought in Rome what they might have found in our own Church, had they allowed themselves time to be instructed in her teaching; or they have been hurried by a violent reaction through finding the common-place statements as to Romanism so untrue; or disgusted by the vague charges and harsh or revolting language too often used[h]; or (from whatever cause) mostly out of Ultra-Protestantism, not at all from among us[i]. Every one

[h] Roman Catholics boast that the meetings of the Reformation Society are always followed by some secessions to them, and I am myself acquainted with instances of the irritating and unsettling effect of the vehemence and want of meekness too often displayed there. Mr. Sibthorp says, "I know not a Protestant controversial writer, (the authors of the Oxford Tracts alone excepted,) whose works did not leave me more a [Roman] Catholic than before." Some Answer, p. 36.

[i] Thus, to take the recent cases, of which this has been surmised, Mr. Sibthorp ascribes his late change to his study of the types of the Old Testament, upon which he entered when recently emerging from Ultra-Protestantism, (see Mr. Dodsworth's Letter

who has been at all consulted, knows cases in which persons who were going over from Ultra-Protestantism, have been thankful to be stayed, and found their rest in the true doctrines of our Church. I might say, that in any case which was not already gone too far, and in some which had gone extremely far, the true exhibition of the character of our Church, and their consequent duties to her and privileges in her, have been, by God's blessing, the effectual means of their recovery. Whoever have given themselves time to become acquainted with her, have rested in her. Those about whom we have had or have most reason to be anxious, have not been persons formed by our teaching, but are such as have struck out views for themselves, or have engrafted any thing we have taught, upon habits and thoughts which they had previously formed, or have been stayed for the time from Romanism by our teaching, or been acted upon by other influences and sympathies, or know no more of it than they who oppose it mostly do, gathering what they do know from common report, and carrying it out in an unreal and impatient spirit. I may say at once, that we have as yet no fears for those, who have been trained by the writings and teaching of those, whom,—one indirectly, the other directly,—God has chiefly em-

to Mr. S. p. 6—8.) An Oxford Tradesman ascribes his to his private study of Hammond, Thorndike, &c. the boy at Shrewsbury School was in habits of intercourse with Roman Catholics.

ployed to form men's minds within our Church, so long as that Church, by no overt acts of herself or her rulers, becomes other than she is.

And surely now, my Lord, when the very atmosphere is full of controverted doctrine, when the very periodical or daily press teems with discussions on the Church, Unity, Apostolical Succession, and, alas! on our holy Mysteries themselves, discussing all the details of doctrine or discipline wherein we are at issue with Rome; when people are taught by those most opposed to Catholic teaching to decide upon these points for themselves, and it is taken for granted that any one who has access to Holy Scripture is competent to decide upon them—it is too much to visit upon us any defections which there may be. Persons need not have recourse to the writings of any of us, to become familiar with these topics: I trust, that if they did, they would treat them with a more reverent spirit, and so more safely to themselves than is now too often done. It is not by us, that the young men in this place have now for some months had the subject of Romanism brought before them, or been taught to identify it with some whom they respect or love. The very clamour against "Popery," within or without the Church, is every where tempting persons' curiosity, and enlisting their sympathies; they who know nothing about the "Tracts" have their thoughts turned to Rome, and are interested in her, and study the works of Roman controversialists;

if they become bewildered, who should bear the blame,—they who inculcate the use of "Private judgment" or they who would restrain it[a]? they who enjoin obedience to the Church which has the succession from the Apostles, or they who set the individual's judgment as to Holy Scripture, above the authority of the Church?

It is not, as I said, my Lord, to excuse ourselves that I wish to impress upon the mind of your Grace and your Grace's brethren, a deeper view of the tendencies to Romanism than some of them seem to have taken; we have little to look for, except to finish our course, in sorrow or in joy, or in joy amid sorrow, as our Master wills; whether we have "honour or dishonour," will soon be no matter to us, save that we know that dishonour was the portion of our Master and His Apostles, and is the safer for those who would be His disciples. It is not for ourselves at all that I write; it is for our Church, lest she hereafter lose some of the

[a] See a very valuable article in the British Critic, No. 59. "On the use of Private Judgment," in which the writer shews that "Private Judgment" leads people *to* Rome just as much as away from it. The object of this Article is to shew, that the legitimate province of Private Judgment is to discover who is its authorized teacher, and that the English Church being such an one, "Dissenters ought to abandon *their* communion, members of the English Church ought not to abandon theirs." With this ought to be combined a previous Article by the same writer. Brit. Crit. No. 53. "On the Catholicity of the English Church."

flower of her sons; it is for them lest they be lost to the office which God had assigned them, and be betrayed into what would be undutifulness and sin. Unless our Bishops know the extent and character of our dangers, they cannot know how to guard against them; the very remedies they adopt may aggravate the disease, which they know not of. They may be applying stimulants, when they would, if they knew it, use lenitives.

II. And this I regret to say has been the result of the late Charges of some of our Bishops. It may seem, at first sight, undutiful, that the censures of Bishops should harass and cause impatience, and rather tend to unsettle persons in their Church, than convince and correct. It should be otherwise. But, my Lord, much confusion has arisen from people's forgetting that it is to our own Diocesan, not to other Bishops, that we owe obedience. All we should respect for their office sake, but it is to our own that we are to listen. It is, of course, a sad state of things in any Church, that they who should be overseers should need remonstrance from those in inferior office; but, not to go back to more ancient precedents, one of the most important controversies in our Church was carried on by a Presbyter against a Bishop, and succeeding Bishops could not but approve of the strong vindications of the principles of the Church by Law against Hoadley.

And this (painful as it is to allude to it) has

been the most distressing part of some of the late Charges. It is humiliating to our whole Church that persons who, in better days, would have been formed in the full possession of Catholic truth, should by our degeneracy have been thrown upon a system, in itself opposed to it, though neutralized in a degree by the influence of our Church. Yet it cannot be denied, that to those, unacquainted with the way in which that system is held in our Church, some of the Charges did, at first sight, seem to involve a denial of Catholic Truth. There is certainly in them a very inadequate statement of that Truth, and much which, to those not habituated to the mode of thought in the school in question, would seem a contradiction of it. But on this I shall have to trouble your Grace hereafter, in speaking of the Charges themselves. My object in adverting to it now, is to remove the impression of inconsistency, if they who have most vindicated the lawful authority of Bishops, should in any case be laid under the miserable necessity of speaking against what they deliver, or protesting against their teaching or their acts. I trust this may not be; but our duty to our Bishop is limited by his duty to the Church; he speaks to us as her representative; *through* her he received his authority, although *from* her Lord; his commission is to enforce her teaching, not to gainsay it; he received the succession from the Apostles, that he might hand down the deposit of teaching committed to

the Church[a]; if then unhappily (as did Bp. Hoadley) he contravene his commission and her Articles of faith, it becomes a duty in any one, (while ready patiently to take any consequences,) to speak in behalf of the common faith. Our own commission, as Priests, is in terms as unconditional towards our flocks; "the Priest's lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek for the law at his mouth;" but if we go against the teaching of our Church, an appeal lies against us; in regard to a Bishop, the responsibility is the greater, by how much the confusion arising is the more sad; but his duties are the same as our's, our duty of protest the same as those of our flocks. I trust that, guided as our Church now is, no such unhappy necessity will arise; I would only explain how minds the most dutiful may be led to entertain these feelings, and be disquieted by the very shadow of so great an evil.

I may add that this duty of protest is not indefinite, nor another form of exercising "private judgment," but opposed to it; its subject is not what any may *think* Catholic truth, but the articles of the Creed. It was thus stated some years past; and this statement I may the rather cite, as shewing incidentally that it is not (as some, judging from their own principles, might be ready to suspect) an afterthought, provided to justify opposition to authority, if turned against us,—having been put forth contemporaneously with the inculcation of

[a] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

submission, and when it seemed altogether an abstract principle, least likely to be called, in this way, into action.

"As[b] they" [the world] "are eager to secure their liberty in religious opinions as the right of every individual, so do we make it every individual's prerogative to maintain and defend the Creed. They cannot allow more to the individual in the way of variety of opinion, than we do in that of confessorship. The humblest and meanest among Christians may defend the faith against the whole Church, if the need arise. He has as much stake in it and as much right to it, as Bishop or Archbishop, and has nothing to limit him but his intellectual capacity of doing so. The greater his attainments the more serviceably of course and the more suitably will he enter into the dispute; but all that learning has to do for him is to ascertain the fact, what is the meaning of the Creed in particular points, since matter of opinion it is not, any more than the history of the rise and spread of Christianity itself."

Thus, my Lord, while persons have been painfully alive to the character which might be insensibly given to our Church, yet, where deference might lawfully be shewn, from each to his own Bishop, censures, which I cannot but deem mistaken, have been borne very patiently. One of the Bishops who has thought it necessary thus to speak, has, I have understood, been much affected by the meek manner in which his reproofs were received by those whom they most wounded. But the body of the Church and those in whose behalf I am most deeply interested, have been

[b] Mr. Newman on Romanism, &c. Lect. x. init. 1837.

rather lookers-on than the direct objects of censure, and not having been subdued by personal pain, have been the more harassed by what has taken place. And that which harasses them is this. They have been formed or formed themselves in what we feel assured is Catholic teaching, in its main outlines instilled into us in our Liturgy and Catechism, taught in our Homilies, at the least consistent with our Articles, even where these are the least definite. This belief has become part of themselves; they cannot part with it, assured that God has given it to them through His Church, that it is part of the treasure committed to her keeping. Us (however unworthy such as myself, and however imperfectly any of us may have set forth that system) they look upon as its representatives in our Church. If then they who are in authority seem, from want of sufficient explanation, to censure our teaching broadly, it comes to them like a rejection of themselves from our Church. They find their belief disavowed, themselves disowned; whither are they to turn? It is not come to this yet; they who have spoken have been but a few; but it has been a distressing presage of what was to follow. "If all or the majority of our Bishops so speak," is their feeling, "will it not be a virtual disavowal of Catholic doctrine by the heads of our Church? And will it then be safe to abide in the Church, whose heads shall have so disavowed it?" This may be an undue anxiety about the morrow, and a mistrust of

God's Providence over our Ancient Church, which for so many centuries He has protected. I am not saying whether they ought so to feel; I am only stating what their feelings are. And to this they will ever be edged on by those, who are watching to take advantage of our perplexities. We are at a critical moment in our Church; every move is of an importance we know not of; and there is one at hand intently watching us, intent mostly on the destruction of our Church, and passing no movement by. I would request, in illustration, your Grace's attention to the importance given to the recent Charge of the Bishop of Durham in an article whose sole object is to add to the perplexities of those, who take an unfavourable view of the original structure of our Articles[k]. The immediate argument of the text relates to a distinct subject, the imponens of the Articles; I only allege it to shew how your Lordships' expressions are watched; and the note appended will shew one use to which the writer wishes to turn it.

"Are we wrong in supposing that a Bishop, making a Charge to his Clergy, speaks formally as a Bishop? If not, we would ask, when or how does he so speak, or when does he address the 'us' of the text, meaning, we suppose,

[k] Dublin Review, No. 21. p. 248, 9. It is a further illustration of the use made of these Charges, that the very title prefixed shews the existence of a spurious edition, "*Salutary cautions against the errors contained in the Oxford Tracts* [Tracts for the Times]. A Charge to his Clergy delivered at St. Nicholas' Church, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on Monday, Aug. 9, 1841. By the Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Durham."

the Clergy subject to him? If he does, then let us turn to the Bishop of Durham's Charge. 'And now,' it says, '. . . I must call your attention to the obligation which rests upon me, *your bishop*, on this our day of solemn meeting, *and to the manner in which you also are bound to act towards me*, who, however unworthily, am called upon thus personally, *and from the chair of office*, to address you.' (p. 3.) The Bishop, then, is about to speak episcopally, ex cathedrâ, as his own words imply. In page 6, his Lordship thus speaks: 'Strongly, then, must I repeat my regret, that with nothing like an appearance of stringent necessity, or the prospect of adequate advantage, *the writers of those Tracts* should have come forward to disturb the peace of the Church.' A Bishop formally speaking as such from the chair of office thus addresses his Clergy: 'A laboured attempt has been made to *explain away the real meaning of our Articles*, and infuse into them a more kindly spirit of accommodation to the opinion and practices of the Church of Rome. Under these circumstances, however painful may be the task of animadverting upon opinions espoused by persons otherwise so respectable, I consider it incumbent upon me *to pronounce my deliberate judgment*.' (p. 7.)

The note appended is,

"Mr. Ward has contemplated the course which an individual clergyman might be compelled to pursue, should his Bishop condemn the doctrine of the Tracts: 'It is, I suppose, considered by some that his Lordship (the Bishop of Oxford) decided ex cathedrâ, that such a mode of interpreting the Thirty-nine Articles was inadmissible; the result of which course would be, that those who held preferment in the diocese of Oxford, in virtue of subscription to them in such sense would, to say the least, be in a most painful position, unless they threw up such preferment." (Appendix, p. 13.)

I may add, that there are too many even in our own Church, who, little acquainted with our writings, and knowing us only from ex-parte statements and vague reports, are only anxious to see us removed, at any cost, from the Church. They have no thought of schism as a sin; they think of us but as a disease in the Church; and they only wish to see the Church set free from us, even though the act whereby it should be freed, were our sin. Or, having identified their own views with the truth, they are impatient of any thing which counteracts the exclusive dominancy of their views, and would be glad of any thing which would rid them of an antagonist principle; they would be glad to reign, if need were, without us, "vacua in aula," even though the Courts from which they would exclude us are the Courts of the Lord's House, the Temple to be left empty is the Temple of our God.

Your Grace will not think that, in expressing a wish that caution and tender care should be used, I mean to suggest any thing so unseemly as that our Bishops should not speak what to them seems necessary for the well-being of their Dioceses. If any think that we have wrought no good service, that all we have done has been in a wrong direction, such must condemn us. If any think we have "come forward to disturb the peace of the Church with nothing like an appearance of stringent necessity, or the prospect of adequate advantage[g],"

[g] Charge of the Bishop of Durham, p. 10.

or that the whole question is one about "antiquated ceremonies," he must think that we have acted very sinfully; and if he really come to this conclusion upon adequate knowledge of our writings, he must say so. My object in addressing your Grace is not to ask any thing of their hands who think of us as these must do, but of those who think that we have toiled faithfully and not altogether in vain, that when they censure what in us they deem wrong, they would not withhold the expression of their sympathy in what they esteem well done. Let them reprove, but in kindness.

I mean not to throw blame on what has been done, though I think it mistaken. I hope even that good may be brought out of it. One must even be glad that they who seemed most alienated from Episcopal authority, are now being won to it for the time, by its being apparently exercised in the direction in which they wish; hereafter perhaps the sounder and earnest among them may learn to respect it on higher grounds. It is very natural that, brief as our Bishops' Charges generally are, they should address themselves to the point which they deem of pressing importance. The Bishops seem to have had in view certain dangers from insulated statements; amid their many duties, some of them manifestly have not had leisure to examine as a whole the teaching upon which they had to speak. They seem mostly to have formed their warnings on detached passages, or, at the very

utmost, insulated Tracts, without having time to enquire, whether one part may not have been corrected by another: they did not think it necessary to enter into the whole subject; they thought it their duty to give some specific warnings, lest they should seem to countenance what they do not, and so to leave the subject. On the other hand, the minds of hearers are more alive to censure than to praise; unhappily it interests mankind more; the detail, which it requires, fixes it more in the mind; and so it will happen, even if any services are acknowledged, the censure will be treasured up, the praise forgotten. The multitude is indiscriminating; too many are prejudiced, and interpret what is said according to their own bias. They know little or nothing of the system of which they speak, whether the censure, which they greedily repeat or inculcate, bear upon some doctrine or an individual's mode of stating it, or something only incidentally connected with it; whether it relates to some Catholic truth, or moral habit of mind, or mode of judging of other Churches, or of the character of individuals in our own; so that it relates to something in "the Tracts," forthwith, unless care be taken to express the contrary, they conclude that the whole tenor and substance of our teaching is condemned. And thus, even at the best, it will appear as if we were chiefly blamed, as if persons were being warned against our doctrine, and our view of our Church

and her doctrines were pronounced to be at variance with her principles, when perhaps all which was intended was a caution against some insulated principle, as popularly misunderstood, or which we may have failed sufficiently to explain. Thus, I know that the mildest Charge which was delivered in the past year, and which does in a very kind way recognise services which we have rendered, yet, because the Bishop does go on to point out at greater length some, though fewer and subordinate, points which he considers erroneous, has appeared to be a condemnation.

The Bishop of Ripon says of us,

"In adverting to the opinions of those among the Clergy, who in their writings have advocated the restoration of ancient forms, it may surely be said, that so far as they earnestly call upon us to act up to the principles of our Church—to provide as much as in us lies, that she become in practice what she professes to be in theory—encouraging us to aim more fervently and resolutely at that high mark of holiness, self-denial, self-discipline, and almsgiving, which she holds forth to our view, and to live up to the elevated standard she sets before us, arousing us at the same time to a stricter sense of our accountableness to God, they deserve our honour and our thanks; still further I believe that they have done good service to the Church, in bringing forward more prominently some comparatively neglected truths with regard to the proper standing of the Church herself and her Ministers; as well as in leading some who were, perhaps unconsciously, inclined to view the Holy Sacraments as mere badges of the Christian profession, and the Holy Eucharist as little more than a commemorative rite, to entertain a juster sense of their real import."

This does indeed acknowledge the character of our efforts; this has been the object of our lives now these many years, to rouse our Church and ourselves to realize what she is in God's appointment, her Apostolic character, her high gifts, to stir up the gift which is in her, to act worthily of all God's past and present mercies. This is the ideal which we have proposed to ourselves,—not to alter any thing in her[h], but to recall the minds of her children to what she plainly has and teaches, and as occasion may offer, to develope according to primitive antiquity those doctrines and practices in her, which she has, yet, for some reason, not so explicitly as the rest. If I may address to your Grace, as a declaration of the principles and object of our lives, words which I have lately used[i], we have felt that

"We have our office plainly marked out to us, (as has been often said,) to labour to act up to the principles of our Church, and to lead others to do the same; so shall we be formed, and aid (under the Divine grace) to form others in the mould of "godliness, righteousness, and soberness of life," provided in her; we have but to seek to form ourselves and others in His holy faith and the keeping of His commandments, and commit our Church and ourselves to Him, to deal with us, as in His Infinite Mercy He may vouchsafe."

What we felt at the outset to be most wanting to our Church in her practical character, was what

[h] Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 15—22.

[i] Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 180.

the Bishop of Ripon has acknowledged in us. We did not wish to oppose any thing existing; we acknowledged, as far as it was true, the value and power of the popular system in its warnings against the world, its urgent calls to conversion, its pointing to our Blessed Lord as the Author and Finisher of our faith. But we felt it to be in part defective, in part erroneous; it laid the foundation, but too often neglected to build thereupon; it spoke of the Cross, but not of bearing it; it shrunk from inculcating "Judgment to come," "according to our works," the value of good works, of regular devotion, of self-discipline, of alms-deeds, and mercifulness; it but little appreciated the doctrine of the Sacraments, and therewith the mysteriousness of our life in Christ, our responsibilities, or the nature of repentance. Of the Church, as the mystical body of Christ, it had no thought at all. We set ourselves not to oppose, but to supply what was lacking, wishing not to irritate but to win; hoping that the exhibition of the truth would gain those who were susceptible of it, and that as it was received, what was erroneous would detach itself and sink of itself, even in the very process that what was true allied itself to the kindred truth, infused into it.

Truly and kindly has the Bishop of Ripon described our efforts to be, as far as in us lay, to call upon the sons of our Church "to act up to her principles," to realize the "high mark of holiness,

self-denial, self-discipline, almsgiving," exhibited in her Liturgy, to "arouse us to a stricter sense of our accountableness," to "bring forward more prominently some neglected truths as to the proper standing of the Church and her Ministers," to "lead some to a juster sense of the real import of the Holy Sacraments." These were indeed worthy objects put into our hands, and all within the bounds of our Church—to realize our blessings, God's gifts, our own responsibilities, the high mark we are to aim at, the mode of girding ourselves to it, the account we are to give of all to Him.

But the Bishop of Ripon even goes further in detail; he not only incidentally says, "fasting and self-denial, when used as instruments of self-discipline to keep the body under, as a help to prayer—we know to be truly scriptural and Godly and edifying," whereas another Bishop[k] says of us, "The necessity of fasting is inculcated, and its merit enhanced too eagerly;" but even on the interpretation of Article 22, he sanctions the very distinction which I have endeavoured to draw out at some length, while other Bishops speak of our propositions having been authoritatively condemned[l], or say that for any to speak of the topics of that Article as only *condemned according to the Romish*

[k] Bp. of Durham, p. 24.

[l] By the four tutors,—"propositions, of which it has been well and *authoritatively* said." ib. p. 16.

doctrine[m] on these points," and otherwise admissible, "would, in a Clergyman, be departing from the sense of the Articles to which he subscribes."

The Bishop of Ripon, on the other hand, lays down the Roman doctrine, states it to be condemned, and implies that any doctrine different from this is not condemned.

"We must[n], as I conclude, in subscription to the Twenty-second Article, condemn the doctrine, that the sins committed after Baptism, even of those whose eternal punishment is remitted for the sake of Christ's merits, must be expiated, either by acts of penance in this life, or in a state of suffering and torment beyond the grave; this being, as far as I can collect, what is meant by the *Romish* doctrine of Purgatory; but I can scarcely suppose that any one ever imagined himself precluded by this subscription, from holding *any* opinion respecting an intermediate state, in which, *possibly*, the spirits of just men may repose from their labours *without suffering*, or indeed from entertaining any sentiment not included within the above definition of the Roman Purgatory. And so in like manner with the rest of the heads of the Article. Having ascertained what was the doctrine respecting the Invocation of Saints, to which the Church of Rome was held to be committed at the time the Article was penned, I should feel myself bound to subscribe in that sense, which I believe to be the legitimate and true one."

The Bishop's concluding caution,

"It surely can never do good service to the cause of that pure religion which has been committed to our keeping, to

[m] Bp. of Chester, p. 78, 9. [n] P. 27.

speak in such a way either of this or any kindred practice, as shall encourage its adoption[n],"

is the very ground which induced Mr. Newman to speak so indistinctly at first; no one could warn more seriously[o] of the risk attending the resumption of any such practice; and his example has been followed by those who have since spoken, Mr. Ward[p] and myself[q].

Indeed, while the Bishop thinks it right to warn against the views of the Reformation and the Reformers, which have been lately more put forward[r], and regards the framers of Edward the Sixth's Articles as the imponents of ours[s], he sanctions *the* Catholic interpretation as much as ourselves. He objects only to the principle of arbitrarily affixing a sense which any one may *deem* Catholic; he doubts not, "knowing the respect in which our Reformers held Catholic Antiquity, that they correctly embodied that sense in them." On one doctrine only, does he remark on any of our doctrinal statements,—my own on Sin after Baptism; on one principle of practice only, that of "reserve as to the doctrine of the ever-blessed Atonement," on both which subjects I wish hereafter to say a few words to your Grace.

[n] P. 27.
[o] Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 19.
[p] Few More Words in support of No. 90, quoted ib. p. 123.
[q] Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 120, sqq.
[r] p. 20.
[s] p. 25.

If, then, amid all this, the Bishop of Ripon is counted among those who reject our views altogether, and condemn ourselves, what will be the case, if Bishops speak less cautiously and less tenderly? In these sad days of division and rebuke, every thing is seized upon as a weapon to demolish that which people dread; they look at things not as they are, but as themselves would have them; they value persons, things, institutions, according as they tell in support of party-views; a person or his work becomes at once, as it may be, learned or pious or judicious or venerable, as soon as he serves an end; they who never paid any respect to a Bishop, or who have spoken contemptuously of his office to his face, hail and extol his authority and magnify his sayings so soon as they are directed against what they dislike. All this is melancholy, very melancholy, and humbling, to ourselves and our Church in which these things are; but since it is so, I would the rather hope that they whose words will be so employed, will consider the more the weight of sayings, which are so to be employed, that they press not the heavier against those already bowed down.

Will your Grace permit me to illustrate my meaning by reference to an older Charge, which went more into detail into our doctrines than any other at that period? In 1836 the Bishop of Exeter laid down, with his usual perspicuity, the doctrine of the Sacraments and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and

the latter in terms which struck myself as so happily chosen, that we added it to our Catena on the subject, instead of closing it with departed Divines. In 1839 he again stated the teaching of the Church on the Apostolical succession, and on the doctrine of the Sacraments in the same manner as we ourselves would do; on the Holy Eucharist, he maintained the right use of a term not contained in our formularies, the "real Presence," which I am not aware that any of us had used; again setting us an example, not simply sanctioning what we had taught. On Tradition again, the Bishop affirms its value,—especially wherein it comes to us with chief authority, the Creeds,—and subsequently objects to individual expressions only of ours, which he thinks to magnify it too much, while he rejects the charge of Popery brought against us, and very severely that of heresy. When he is subsequently led to point out some things which he laments, they are still points of detail; of a mode of speaking of worship of images and invocation of saints less marked than Bishop Hall's; dislike of making Transubstantiation a subject of controversy; my own defence of the practice of prayer for departed Saints; the service sketched in commemoration of Bishop Ken; speaking against the *necessity* of Confession as a "practical grievance," without saying any thing against the Roman statement of the absolute necessity of Absolution by the Priest; my own views of sin after Baptism; reserve on the doctrine of the Atonement. Without

entering into these manifold subjects, the very enumeration shews that most of them are negative only; the degree of blame attaches mostly to what we did not, and not to what we did say or do; one point only is connected with our positive practical teaching,—my own on sin after Baptism;—for although, when blamed as we were, we must maintain Prayers for departed Saints to be a Catholic practice, we never publicly inculcated it. I mean not that the Bishop might not object to other of our language, were he acquainted with it, but he did censure no more. He even concluded his animadversions upon these points with the kind parting words.

"Neither[q] shall I forbear to avow my own opinion, that the Church is on the whole deeply indebted to them.

"In opposition to the low and sectarian notions, which had too long marked much of the popular theology of the times, they have successfully asserted and vindicated some of the most important doctrines and principles of the Catholic Church—doctrines and principles, which, as Ministers of that Church of England, we are under the most express and solemn engagements to maintain."

Yet the Bishop of Exeter also has been alleged in the catalogue of those who have condemned us, and we have been represented as contumacious in continuing to teach, after having been thus rebuked; and that by those, who unhappily seem to deny what the Bishop designates as "some of the most

[q] p. 84.

important doctrines and principles of the Catholic Church," and which he holds that as Ministers of our branch of the Church we are most solemnly bound to teach.

But if this be so as to those who have spoken thus kindly of us, what must be the impression made by such as simply censure us without adverting to any good service we have rendered? Thus, the impression left on my mind by a Charge delivered in the foregoing summer by an Archbishop of the United Church was, that he held that we ought to leave the Church,—meaning probably, abandon our office as Ministers in her. The Bishop of Durham expressly says that we have done no good, that there was no need and no excuse for our efforts, nothing in the existing state of doctrine to call them forth, that the result of our efforts has been very unfortunate, tending to reestablish error rather than truth. The Bishop of Chester seems (shocking as it is to write) to regard us as instruments of Satan to hinder the true principles of the Gospel[a]; his brother, the Bishop of Winchester, speaks more mildly of us, condemns nothing authoritatively, yet sees nothing but evil from us, and no evil except from us[b]; an

[a] See an extract in Note A at the end.

[b] "Are we, then, as a Church, in risk of incurring any such danger?" [being robbed of her internal and spiritual beauty and strength,] "Is our glory in any jeopardy? Is there heard, as it were, something of a confused sound of voices at a distance,

Episcopal Sermon, delivered indeed in much excitement[c], and which has been reprinted here from a Colonial Diocese, as an additional weapon against us, speaks of us as on "the very verge of an apostasy from Christ[d]," meaning indeed thereby an approximation to Rome.

And yet, my Lord, even of these last, (sorrowful as it is to be mistaken by such men,) I would without hesitation affirm that they mostly condemn not ourselves or our principles, but what they conceive to be such. I may say this the more confidently, as having, now these many years, read diligently what has been written against us, and seen how impossible it is to convey to minds, trained in one school of theology, the real character of views at variance with their own. It has been my own lot, as well as that of others, continually to see and hear ascribed to ourselves views and statements, the very reverse of any

which might make some Eli, sitting in the gate, to tremble for the ark of God? If there be in the horizon so much as the earliest rising of a little cloud, you have a right to expect from one in the position which the duty of my office bids me discharge this day, the explicit declaration of my fears." Charge, p. 29. and then he proceeds to speak of what he supposes to be our teaching, and of our's only.

[c] "I am full of fear; every thing is at stake." "I am an alarmist. I believe our Church was never in the danger she now is, except perhaps immediately before the Great Rebellion." i. e. (as it is explained) from Abp. Laud. Ordination Sermon by Daniel Bishop of Calcutta, p. 63, 64, 65.

[d] p. 61.

which we hold. It is even shocking to have to deny or to affirm, respectively, the grievous errors or the elementary Christian truths which it is supposed that we should hold or reject. As a rule, we should be found to reject what we are by this class of minds thought to hold, to hold more nearly what we are thought to reject.

This has arisen out of the circumstances attending the revival of religious earnestness towards the close of the last century. The instruments of that revival looked, in the first instance, for the type of their doctrine, neither to the Reformers of the sixteenth, nor the great Divines of the seventeenth century, but to the Non-conformists. In contrast with a period in which the consciousness of the great truths of the Gospel had become obscure and dim, they seized, as your Grace knows familiarly, one or two fundamental truths, or rather they condensed the whole Gospel into the two fundamental truths of nature and of grace, that by nature we are corrupt, by grace we are saved. Our corruption by nature, our justification by faith were not a summary only, but, in this meagre form, the whole substance of their teaching. Faith also was made the act of the mind, believing and appropriating to itself the merits of our Blessed Lord; the rest of the Christian system or God's gifts, the Church, the Sacraments, good works, holiness, self-discipline, repentance, were looked upon but as introductory or subsidiary, or to follow as a matter of course

upon these, but if thought of any value in themselves, pernicious; to attach value to any of them, was (as we have often been condemned to hear, and shocking as it is to repeat) to substitute (as it might be) the Church or the Sacraments, or repentance or good works for CHRIST. And from this we are but partially recovering. One must respect the sensitiveness of those, who with a "godly jealousy," fear lest any thing be substituted for our Ever-blessed Redeemer. Still one must say that the error is with them. The narrowness of what one must call the "Non-conformist" system (for on the doctrine of Holy Baptism it is plainly at variance with that of the reformers in our Church as well as its formularies) cannot span the largeness of Catholic truth; it cannot expand itself so as to comprise it, and what it cannot take into its own measures, it rejects as superfluous. Measured then by this rule, our teaching must needs be found faulty.

I may the rather venture to say this, my Lord, without arrogancy, because it is difficult to see how one at least of these Charges can otherwise be reconciled with the formularies of our Church, or even the Creeds of the Church Catholic: it is no disrespect to speak of the unclearness or narrowness of a system, even when adopted by a Bishop; it were shocking to think of any thing approaching even to unconscious heresy. If then "justification by faith only" is used to exclude any thing else as

the *meritorious* cause of our salvation, than the merits of our only Lord and Saviour[g], it is, of course, only a brief statement of the whole substance of the Gospel. In this sense it is right to be jealous for the doctrine, and in this the Bishop of Chester must be understood[h] when he condemns as "departing from the sense of the Articles" any who "speak of justification by faith, as if Baptism and newness of heart concurred towards our justification[i];" for to deny in any other sense that Baptism concurred to our justification would be to contravene Holy Scripture, as well as the Creeds and the

[g] "Then will His Cross and Passion again be known, beloved, acknowledged, relied on, gloried in, as the *only meritorious ground of justification*, and His Spirit sought for and honored, as the *only gracious source of holiness and comfort*." Bishop D. Wilson's Charge, p. 69. The Italics are the Bishop's. There must be some miserable confusion when a Bishop could suppose that such elementary truths were not held by any teachers of the Church.

[h] I know not whether it is in the same sense that the Bishop of Winchester expresses his "fears of a system" "which speaks of the Sacraments, not as seals or pledges, but as instruments of salvation in a *justificatory* or causal sense;" for I do not understand what it means. Our passages, to which the Bishop refers, speak of the Sacraments only as "instruments;" an instrument is, in scholastic language, "the immediate cause," (as distinct from the "ultimate cause" or Author,) as our Article also speaks of their being "effectual signs of grace," i. e. effecting what they signify; and of Holy Baptism as "an instrument whereby they who receive it rightly are graffed into Christ's Church." But what "an instrument in a *justificatory* or *causal* sense" is, I know not.

[i] Charge, p. 79.

formularies of our own Church[i]. For in that Holy Scripture, and the Creed after it, speaks of "Baptism for the remission of sins," Baptism must concur to justification, or our being made free from sin; and, (on the narrower ground of our own formularies,) in what other way could each be taught to say that he was "therein made a child of God, member of Christ, inheritor of Heaven?" unless, indeed, a person can have all these glorious gifts and testimonies of God's mercy, and yet be unjustified and lying in his sins, and under God's wrath,—an unjustified "child of God, member of Christ, heir of heaven!"

It is probably in this same sense that the same Bishop condemns those who "speak of Forgiveness or works of mercy, as availing to obtain remission of sins from God;" i. e. (he must mean) meritoriously or in themselves, (which no one affirmed,) else he would contradict Holy Scripture, which says, "Forgive[k], and ye shall be forgiven;" and "When[l] ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any, *that* your Father also, which is in Heaven, may forgive you your trespasses;" and "He[m] shall have judgment without mercy that hath shewed no mercy, and mercy rejoiceth against judgment."

[i] See more at length Mr. Perceval's well-weighed "Letter to the Bishop of Chester, with remarks on his late Charge, more especially as relates to the doctrine of Justification."

[k] Luke vi. 37.

[l] Mark xi. 25.

[m] James ii. 13.

Again, when the Bishop of Winchester expresses his "fears[n]," "if instead of the satisfaction of Christ singly and alone as the ground of our acceptance, a certain inherent meetness of sanctification be so connected with the qualification ab extra, as to confound the operation within with the work of Christ without;" if he means "the *meritorious* ground of acceptance," no one of course holds any thing else; yet he cannot mean to deny altogether that any other ground shall, in any way, be taken into account in the final "acceptance" at the last Day, since our Lord declares that works of mercy will[o].

In like way, one may say of these Charges throughout, that the writers are jealous for truth, or against error, which all earnest minds must be jealous about; only they seem to have these truths fixed in their minds in the (one may say so without disrespect, as speaking of the system, not of the respected individuals) somewhat bald and naked way which characterizes the Genevan school, and measuring doctrines as they stand in other systems by the character which they would occupy in their own, they must condemn them. And thus they might too readily be understood to be condemning, not our teaching only, or that of the great Divines of the seventeenth century, but that of our Church and the Church Catholic, and to be at variance

[n] p. 30. [o] Matt. xxv.

with Holy Scripture. Their chief maxims, that nothing must interfere with the office of Christ, or derogate from the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, all would hold with them, but in the application of these principles, they seem not only to condemn other truth, but even to contradict themselves.

Thus the Bishop of Chester descends even to controvert the thoughtful work of an eminent layman, who has recently developed the doctrine of the mystical character of the Church; and in his anxiety that the Church should not be "made to usurp the place of Christ to perform His acts," so pares down the doctrine, as to seem to leave the Church a mere outward body composed of such as (using an illustration from a regiment[o]) "vow allegiance, and pass through a prescribed form, such for example as Christian Baptism," a body as merely outward as a regiment might be, as not in fact one body, except as an accidental aggregate of individuals can be said to be one. And yet such cannot be his meaning, since though the language of the Article which he quotes is ambiguous, that of our Services falls in with and implies the view which he seems to controvert, that the Church is a mystical body into which they who are saved are gathered one by one, and in it knit to Christ, its and their Head. This is plainly the meaning of our Liturgy when it speaks of "God's elect" being

[o] p. 84 sqq.

" knit together in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of His Son Jesus Christ," or of our being assured by the due reception of the Holy Eucharist, " that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son;" of children " being received into Christ's holy Church," by " being baptized with water and the Holy Ghost," " received into the ark of Christ's Church," being " regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church," " regenerated by God's Holy Spirit, received as His own child by adoption, and incorporated into His Holy Church." The body into which we are engrafted by the spiritual gift of our new birth must itself be spiritual. Such an outward view of the Church would be inconsistent with the Creed itself, " I believe The holy Catholic Church;" for which the Lutherans, on their view, substituted the words " *a* Christian Church."

Yet it is apparent throughout that the Bishop only means to contend against what all would equally reject—any view of the Church which should substitute it for Christ, one which would " so[p] represent it, as to be virtually the author of salvation, instead of the channel through which salvation flows;" although (remarkably enough) the passage from Mr. Gladstone's work which he cites in illustration, does distinctly speak of the

[p] p. 30.

Church, not (it is almost too shocking even to deny) as the Author but as the channel[q]. It is apparent even from the Bishop's own language, for he too speaks, with Holy Scripture, of the Church, as one spiritual body under Christ its Head.—"The[r] Holy Catholic Church, of which Christ is the Head, and with which He has engaged to be by His Spirit unto the end of the world."

I do not mean that there is not a real difference of view between their statements and our own; but it proceeds from defect and omission in theirs, not from direct opposition; ours supply what they omitted, and so, as long as they are satisfied with their own, ours must seem to them redundant. Raised up at a time when the Christian Sacraments were acknowledged but not felt, they took up a system independent of them; they urged conversion, they proposed justification, not by virtue of a Covenant which had been neglected, an en-

[q] "It is in the Church that we have our religious life, *derived* to us not as individuals, but by virtue of incorporation into her body." "God has not chosen to establish His relations with each of us on a distinct and individual footing, but has constituted us in a body, to derive *from its source of life* a portion of its general life." quoted ib. p. 80. The same contrast is observable in all the Bishop's subsequent remarks; as in the saddening words, p. 81, "Shall we write, instead, Come unto *the Church*, and *the Church* shall give you rest?" "Shall we substitute the Church Catholic for the individual Saviour?"

[r] ib. p. 33.

grafting into Christ whose efficacy had been stifled, but de novo, as if every thing past were effaced; as if a man had had no privileges, responsibilities, duties, because he had neglected them. Overlooking the Ordinances whereby God engrafts us into Christ's body, they addressed men as individuals, now for the first time, through their individual faith, to be united to Him; and they the more depreciated His Ordinances, because others urged them to a wrong end,—to supersede the necessity of any actual change, any decided living above the world, or contrast with its ways. They called men who were *in* the Church, as the Apostles called them *into* it; and so must needs overlook the Church herself and the Sacraments whereby men had been brought in; they took one half only of the truth, viz. that the individual must by his personal faith cleave unto his Lord, and overlooked that no human faith nor longings can make a man a member of his Incarnate Saviour, that they only can be united with Him, whom He receives into His mystical Body, and that this His act is the Sacrament of Baptism. They insisted rightly, against the prevailing coldness, on the necessity of individual personal faith, they substituted wrongly the act of man for the Sacrament of Christ; they insisted rightly on the individual relations of the believer to Christ, but failed to perceive that these relations were no less individual, because they belong to us as members of the one Body, whereof

He is the Head. And thus, so long as they teach positively, all can accord with them; when they go beyond it, they seem to oppose Catholic truth as well as our teaching. They have realized the one truth of the individual union with Christ; when they hear of the Catholic doctrine of the Church and of the Sacraments, they know not how to reconcile them with their own partial views, they fear something being "interposed" between the soul and its Redeemer, and so seemingly reject the truth, when they really reject but a partial view of it, which would be destructive of other truth.

It is important, even at the risk of being wearisome to your Grace, to trace this source of apparent opposition in other points, if so it may appear not only that we are not so condemned, but that the points upon which the teachers of our Church are at strife are not, if we rightly understood each other, so numerous as might at first sight seem. Thus, on Tradition, these writers are very jealous for the sufficiency of the Scripture, and too much of course could not be said on that subject, unless in so doing men should seem to praise the word of God. All hold Scripture to be the "sole source of saving Faith;" the only question is about its interpreter, whether it be the individual or the Church. There is no contrast in the mind of any maintainer of Tradition, between Tradition and Holy Scripture, and yet this seems the only contrast in the mind of pious men who impugn it. I say

"of pious men," for too many in these days are anxious to maintain not the independence of Holy Scripture, but their own. And thus it will be that these writers will seem alternately to affirm or condemn, what they condemn us for affirming. Thus the Bishop of Calcutta says, as do we, that it is the office of the Church "to uphold[s] the word of truth, to be the keeper and guardian of Holy Writ—to explain it by comments, creeds, liturgies, articles, and catechisms, and hand it down to successive generations. By these means truth resides in the Church as its fixed seat and proper dwelling." When he adds, "all as a servant, as a handmaid, not as an authority over or co-ordinate with Holy Scripture," he speaks only as we do, who regard the Church as subservient to Holy Scripture; having "authority" not "over" *it*, but "over" *us*. When, further, he adds, the office of the Ministry is to "interpret merely, not change or add to, much less explain away or contradict. The standard of all religious teaching is the Bible and the Bible only;" this is, again, what we should say, if by "standard" he means the *ultimate* authority to which the Church is to appeal. When, again, he says, "We[t] go along with the most ardent admirer of Antiquity in expressing our reverence for this mass of information," [Fathers, Councils, &c.] But why? It is EVIDENCE; it is historical testimony to the fact of certain

[s] Sermon, p. 24.

[t] p. 28. The Capitals are the Bishops.

doctrines, and a certain interpretation of the capital leading passages of Scripture, of a certain number of sacraments, rites, and usages, having been held in all ages, in all parts of the Church and by all persons;" this is what we have said, "Scripture [u] is the document of faith, tradition the *witness* of it; the true Creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or Scripturally proved tradition." Whatever difference there is, relates not to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture in any way, nor to its being the sole source of saving faith, nor to its superiority to man, nor to its authority over the Church; it relates not at all to Holy Scripture but to *us;* not to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture but to *ours;* not to submitting Holy Scripture to the Church Catholic, but *ourselves;* not whether tradition is equally inspired with Holy Scripture, but whether we are equally enlightened and have as much of the Spirit of God, and as much insight into Holy Scripture itself, as the collective wisdom of the Church; not whether the Church has authority over Holy Scripture, but over us; not whether it may "change or add to, explain away or contradict" Holy Scripture, but whether we may "change, explain away, or contradict" the decisions of the Catholic Church. The whole question of tradition relates not to Holy Scripture, but to the individual; and what many who impugn it are half-consciously con-

[u] Tract 78, p. 2.

tending for, is not the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, but the sufficiency of self. This is a question which will probably be more and more developed; there are who contend that the later ages are in religious wisdom richer than the earlier; the stream purer as it flows downwards; the division of these last times more enlightened (and more loving doubtless, and more enlightened because more loving!) than the unity of the first; and so criticism too, doubtless a better guide to "the mind of Christ" than holiness, the decay of the Church more guided by her Lord and blessed with His fuller Presence, than her first love. But, apart from this, the struggle which is being carried on every where, and which is the characteristic contest of the "last times," is that between the individual will and authority; it pervades politics and religion; without the Church it is the question of submitting the reason to mysteries, "the prostration," as your Grace once spoke, "of the understanding" before revelation; within, it is of the submission of the individual judgment to that of the Church. This is a question of religious temper of mind, of first importance; and there are symptoms even within the Church that this struggle is being secretly carried on, under the fair colours of zeal for the "sufficiency of Holy Scripture;" it is to be feared that when the right-minded understand each other better, the mask will be drawn aside by those who are not so, and the untruth avowed more nakedly; it is one of the signs

of the last Apostacy; but it is happily not at issue between these Bishops and ourselves.

In other points again, the Bishop of Chester shews what the error is which he means to condemn, and so, though he rejects statements, which are borne out by Catholic consent, there is no reason to infer that he rejects the truth they contain, but only the error, which though they do not, he supposes them to maintain. Thus it was part of the vague way of thinking in a past period, to suppose that *any* change in the sacred elements involved Transubstantiation, whereas that word designates only that particular change, "whereby the substance of the sacred elements ceases to be." When then he condemns [x] as "departing from the sense of the Articles," those who "speak of the consecrated elements as not remaining simply what they were before, and what to sight they seem," and refers, as his authority, to the Article condemning Transubstantiation, we may plainly limit his condemnation to this, and not suppose him to contravene Antiquity, which continually affirms *a* change, as indeed it is implied by the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost in all ancient liturgies except the Roman, and by the very act of consecration.

Or, to speak on one subject which has been perhaps more widely misunderstood than any other,

[x] p. 79.

(though not a doctrine,)—" reserve" or reverence "in communicating religious knowledge,"—the principle of the tracts on that subject, (of which an impartial person has said that " they contain as much deep and true philosophy as any in the whole series,") may be expressed in few words: " great reverence is to be used lest you propose religious truth to minds unfit to receive it." Whatever rule as to holy truth is meant by our Blessed Lord's words, " Give not that which is holy to dogs, nor cast your pearls before swine," that and no other is meant by these Tracts. This is contrary not (God forbid) to the preaching of the Atonement, but to a sadly irreverent way of preaching it, as the means of conversion, which has been too common. Judgment to come, not the Atonement, is the doctrine preached by the Apostles as the means of conversion; and then, when men " were pricked in their heart," " remission of sins." Even the school in question abstractedly acknowledged the principle, in that their Sermons were wont to consist of two parts; the first, inculcating our lost condition through nature, the second, salvation through the Blood of Christ. Even according to them, the Atonement was not to be preached, until people were supposed to be convinced of their " lost and ruined condition;" which involves the very principle in question.

Any condemnation then of the principle, as " keeping back the blessed doctrine of Atone-

ment"—except when minds are for the time unfit to receive it, when it might harden rather than soften them,—censures not the principle, but one which the author of those Tracts equally condemns. How entirely those Tracts have been misunderstood, has become apparent in reference to one particular Charge, the author having shewn, by aid of parallel columns[a], that all which the Bishop wished him to have said, he had said, and not said, what he wished unsaid. I may use words of his own to myself; "The propositions condemned by the Bishop I not only never expressed or thought of, but disapprove of in the strongest manner as extremely wrong."

Another of these Charges furnishes in a different way a remarkable illustration of the same misunderstanding. The Bishop of Winchester seems to imagine that the principle involves a keeping back of religious truth altogether, not a reverent and holy imparting of it. Hence many of the cases which he quotes from Holy Scripture to disprove the principle, are in fact instances of it; how our Lord *in private* gave a fuller insight into Divine mysteries to those prepared to receive them, as to the eleven after the resurrection, or to the sincere and enquiring Nicode-

[a] A Few Remarks on the Charge of the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, on the subject of reserve in communicating religious knowledge as taught in the Tracts for the Times, No. 80 and No. 87, by the writer of those Tracts.

mus; or Himself prepared them before He even declared the truths of nature, as when He "convinced of sin" the woman of Samaria, before He declared to her the spiritual being of God; or how, in public, He veiled the truth before those who were about to "rend" Him, as in that mysterious intimation, "Destroy this temple[b]." It might illustrate these misconceptions further, that the same Bishop supposes[c] the way of teaching recommended in this Tract to be parallel with the dry moral preaching too common in the last century.

In a word, all the Bishops who have blamed these Tracts have blamed but one statement, in a sense not held by the Author, not borne out (one must say) by the tenor of the Tract and of our teaching, and subsequently explained by him[d]. I may say,

[b] "At the first Passover He assumed a right over His Father's House by cleansing the Temple—a declaration [rather, a veiled intimation] of the Divine prerogative of the strongest kind. His discourse with Nicodemus is based upon the doctrine of regeneration—the deepest theological truth. His conversation with the woman of Samaria revealed that 'God is a Spirit'—the most abstract metaphysical truth. We remember how some months before His Crucifixion, He *intimates* the Sacrifice Itself and its object, 'Destroy this temple.' 'The Son of Man must be lifted up.' 'The bread that I give is My Flesh, which I give for the life of the world.' And it was His last care, *immediately before the Ascension*, to enter *with the eleven* into the full explanation of,' &c. Charge of the Bp. of Winchester, p. 31.

[c] Ib. p. 31.

[d] In Tract 87. The Charge of the Bishop of Exeter was delivered before the publication of the second Tract. The Bishop of Gloucester is stated "upon the best authority" to have

without disrespect, that I cannot but regard it as an instance, in which the Bishops have been unconsciously acted upon by current statements and vague accusations, rather than themselves acted on their own dispassionate and mature judgment. Certainly, there is in all a remarkable repetition of the same general statement, "keeping back of the doctrine of the Atonement," and no indication of any acquaintance with the principles of the Tracts themselves.

Yet the treatment of these Tracts which has been thus unhappily countenanced,—being condemned and spoken of lightly, without being considered,—is but one form of that very habit of mind, against which they were directed. The opposition to them originated mostly in the very need of the medicine which it rejected. Had the Tracts been entitled, "On *reverence* in communicating religious knowledge," it would have been a severe condemnation of the error which they now treat more tenderly, but one which could have been less easily eluded. As it is, people have gone off upon a name, and shrunk from the substance. The real aim of those Tracts is to correct irreverence in handling religious truth. And of this there is but too much need. Our age is irreverent; irreverence pervades almost all the discussion of sacred subjects; in speaking and writing alike, people forget of Whom they are

referred only to Tract 80, not being acquainted with Tract 87. (Church Intelligencer, No. 31.)

speaking, Whose words they are using, Whose Mysteries they are handling, about Whose very Nature they are bandying words; they forget themselves and God, and so have been turned against that, which condemned themselves. Profaneness is the very characteristic of the world[e]; but alas! one need not go to the world for absence of reverence; the very handling of the most sacred subjects of human thought in our daily press side by side with the things of this world is irreverent; one cannot read a page of them without being pained by irreverence; one need only think of any one subject, as those which our Church still calls "holy Mysteries,"—what language is used either as to the Romanist doctrine or Catholic truth, when and how, by whom and before whom they are discussed! One can hardly understand how they who hold them to be mysteries can so speak, or they who so speak can retain the sense of their being mysteries. Or to consider again the hard dry way in which the Blessed doctrine of the Atonement has been illustrated or vindicated, until one knows not which was most rationalistic, the defence or (grievous as it is to say) the attack! Or to take lighter cases, how frequent it is, even in the most sacred places, much more in so-called religious meetings, to hear religious truths so spoken of,

[e] There is a fearfully condensed picture (though from the nature of the subject in allusion chiefly) in a thoughtful article in the British Critic, No. 61, p. 237.

that any one must be certain that the speaker is not for the time thinking whereon he is speaking. For myself, when I first learnt the substance of those Tracts, I felt that they conveyed a lesson we all needed, that their teaching, well-weighed, would deepen all our reverence, and teach us, almost all, how much it needed to be deepened. They seemed to come most seasonably also, (one might say, providentially,) at the revival of religious truths, as a warning against bringing them forward, as people are wont, without due reverence to the sacredness of that wherewith they are entrusted, or regard to their own temper of mind, or that of those to whom they declared them. I have since met with many, who entered upon the study of them with minds prejudiced against them by the popular misrepresentations, but I have not met with one, who, (whether he acquiesced or no in all the details,) did not express himself deeply indebted to them. It will not, I trust, seem disrespectful if I express my conviction that our Bishops, had they fully considered *both* these Tracts, would, instead of singling out one topic for condemnation, have recommended their general teaching, as a corrective of so much under which we are now suffering [d].

[d] A valuable analysis of them, and independent testimony to their value, is given by the Rev. H. A. Woodgate, "A Brief Analysis of the Tracts on Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge in the Series called Tracts for the Times: with Remarks on the same."

Even as to that Tract, which, perhaps from some few expressions in it, or its original designed indefiniteness on some points, has been most animadverted on, it may be the rather hoped that not the actual interpretation of the Articles in Tract 90, but their supposed tendencies have been censured, since my own vindication of them has, with one exception, escaped censure; and in that one, in addition to the extensive misunderstandings which I have pointed out, language of the Homilies[e] has been censured as much as my own. I must, however, candidly avow my belief, that had there not been a strong, traditional[f] but unauthorized, interpretation in the one direction, which Tract 90 struck at the roots, there would not have been that alarm, which at first certainly prevented an unbiassed view[g]

[e] In that the Homilies speak of "the Sacrament of Matrimony;" the expression has of late been vindicated in the abstract, but not used; the Bishop of Chester condemns it. p. 79.

[f] This Mr. Newman avows it to be his desire to oppose, "I should not be honest if I did not add, that I consider our own Church, on the other hand, to have in it a traditionary system, as well as the Roman, beyond and beside the letter of its formularies, and to be ruled by a spirit far inferior to its own nature. And this traditionary system not only inculcates what I cannot receive, but would exclude any difference of belief from itself. To this exclusive modern system, I desire to oppose myself." Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 17, 18.

[g] The Bishop of Llandaff, however, kindly observes in reference to this same Tract, "He" [Mr. Newman] "has been, I think, unjustly accused of leaning towards Popery—for his language has been strong and unequivocal in condemning the usurpation,

being taken of it. In one instance, we must gratefully acknowledge, that the Catholic sense of the Articles is explicitly acknowledged, and the judgment only of our Reformers, as being many and revering Catholic Antiquity, is preferred to the judgment of any individual, as to what the Catholic sense is[h]. One general misconception I may yet remove, as though Mr. Newman had set himself systematically to prove that "a person adopting the[i] doctrines of the Council of Trent, with the single exception of the Pope's supremacy, might sincerely and conscientiously sign the Articles of the Church of England." Of this there is no appearance in the Tract itself, nor of any systematic design in it: the allusions to the Council of Trent are incidental only[k], correcting ultra-interpretations of some of its decrees. It may suffice to notice, that as to the most important and difficult

and the corrupt unscriptural tenets of that Church;" on Roman Catholic Errors, p. 87. He points out also that the Tract so far from favouring the *actual* system in the Church of Rome, implies that it is worse than at the Council of Trent. ib.

[h] "Knowing the respect in which our Reformers held Catholic Antiquity, I should believe that they were more likely to have correctly embodied that sense in it [the wording] than I, as an individual, should be, to discover that sense for myself." Bp. of Ripon's Charge, p. 25.

[i] Bp. of Gloucester's Charge, p. 35.

[k] This also is stated by Mr. Newman, "That *while I was writing it* [Tract 90] I was not unwilling to shew that the Decrees of Trent were *but partially*, if at all, committed to *certain* popular errors, I fully grant; but even this I did with reference to others." Postscript to Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 1.

Decree, that on Transubstantiation, no attempt is made, either to reconcile it with Antiquity or with our Articles. As little ground is there for the conjecture[i], that "the real object of the writer was to prove that the differences in doctrine which separate the Church of England and Rome will upon examination vanish." Any such question the writer has stated[j] to be, in his opinion, unsuited to

[i] "The real object, at which the writer *seems* to be labouring is, &c." ib. p. 36.

[j] "In like manner I have set my face altogether against suggestions which zealous and warm-hearted persons sometimes have made of reviving the project of Archbishop Wake, for considering the differences between ourselves and the foreign Churches with a view to their adjustment. Our business is with ourselves—to make ourselves more holy, more self-denying, more primitive, more worthy our high calling. Let the Church of Rome do the same, and it will come nearer to us, and will cease to be what we one and all mean, when we speak of Rome. To be anxious for a composition of differences, is to begin at the end. Did God visit us with large measures of His grace, and the Roman Catholics also, they would be drawn to us, and would acknowledge our Church as the Catholic Church in this country, and would give up whatever offended and grieved us in their doctrine and worship, and would unite themselves to us. This would be a true union; but political reconciliations are but outward, and hollow, and fallacious. And till they renounce political efforts, and manifest in their public measures the light of holiness and truth, perpetual warfare is our only prospect. It was the prophetic announcement concerning the Elijah of the first Advent, that he should 'turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers.' This is the only change which promises good and is worth an effort." Letter to the Bp. of Oxford, p. 43, 44. "Those who are immediately about me, know that in the interval between the

the present state of the two Communions; both Churches must be other than we are, before the question of union can be healthfully entertained by either.

I have thus, at the risk of wearying your Grace, gone through the main topics of these Charges, in order to shew that even in them it is mostly not our doctrine which is condemned, but, as I said, something which we should equally condemn ourselves; that, when we take more pains to understand one another, unity within our Church is not so hopeless, as amid our distractions it now seems. But although one may see this one's self and so look hopefully onward to a rest for our Church, even if we should have entered first, as we hope, into our own, this will not be the ordinary impression. These Bishops mean to condemn what they think us to be. And what have we to set against all this, why this should not be accounted as the earnest of the voice of those set over us in the Church? While some Bishops, who belong to an opposite school of theology, do condemn what they think is our teaching, others, who were formed in the same general outline of doctrine as ourselves, are thought to condemn us, another condemns us

printing and publication of the Tract, I was engaged in writing some Letters about Romanism in which I spoke of the impossibility of any approach of the English toward the Roman Church, arising out of the present state of the latter, as strongly as I did a year ago, or as I do now in my Letter." Postscript to Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 1.

in the mass, without apparently knowing any of the details of what we have taught, but thinks that instead of the Church, the Sacraments, repentance, "righteousness, temperance, judgment to come" according unto our works, the whole is a question of the revival of ceremonies, or "the follies of by-gone superstitions[k]," how may not younger or less-disciplined or more ardent minds be well disquieted at the prospect? For ourselves, we had enough in the acquittal, some years past, of our own Bishop. But for the Church at large, what is there to counterbalance all this? Except some kind expressions, some years past, of one Bishop[l], and, in the last year, of another[m], nothing has been said, except what has been lost sight of, as though uttered in extenuation only of censure.

And this is the more aggravated, through the relative position of the two great sections of our Church. Two schemes of doctrine, the Genevan and the Catholic, are, probably for the last time, struggling within our Church; the contest, which has been carried on ever since the Reformation, between the Church and those who parted from her, has now been permitted to be transferred to the Church herself; on the issue hangs the destiny

[k] Bp. of Durham, p. 12.

[l] Bishop of Lincoln.

[m] Bp. of Llandaff, on Roman Catholic Errors, p. 87 and note, whose personal kindness the writer especially has gratefully to acknowledge.

of our Church; if human frailty or impatience precipitates not that issue, all will be well, and it will have a peaceful close; yet a decisive issue it must have; the one must in time absorb the other; or, to speak more plainly, the Catholic, as the full truth of God, must, unless it be violently cast out, in time, leaven and absorb into itself whatever is partial and defective; as it has already very extensively. I do not wish to call the attention of your Grace or any other of your Grace's brethren to any defects on the other side. But if every thing is said on the side of supposed excess, nothing of defect; if they are blamed who interpret our Eucharistic Service in its fullest sense by the Liturgies from which it is derived, they are not blamed, who explain away it or our Baptismal Service by the Zuinglian school, or even omit Baptismal prayers, whose plain meaning condemns their system; if they are censured who fill up inadequate statements in our Articles by the teaching of the Church Catholic, they uncensured who pare down the meaning of our Liturgy; they censured who bring up the meaning of our Articles when indefinite to our Liturgy, they uncensured, who bring down the definite meaning of our Liturgy to the lowest interpretation which can be affixed to the Articles; must it not be thought that the sympathies of our Bishops, are with those who are treated thus leniently, against those whom they censure? This

has been already felt. In one Diocese, which was becoming more tranquil, and there seemed hopes of a better mutual understanding, thanks were publicly given in one chief place, that the Bishop had from that pulpit denounced our teaching as "another Gospel[n];" in another great city, the people were instructed to look upon the teaching of a portion of the Ministers of their Church, as the teaching of Satan. Would that this were an insulated case!

If this goes on, my Lord, where is it to end? If our own Bishops and others encouraged by them say to us—sore as it is to repeat, they are their own words—"Get thee hence, Satan,"—while those of the Roman Communion pray for us, and invite us, is it not sorely adding to the temptations, I say not of ourselves, but of younger men? The young are guided by their sympathies more than by their convictions; our position is

[n] The Bishop of Gloucester plainly meant to enforce the principle that individual character is no excuse for bringing in error of any kind; "But if an Angel from heaven preach 'any other Gospel than that which we have received' from the Apostles and Evangelists, I trust that he will preach in vain." (p. 38.) He could not have meant what the words would go to, since he had just said; "I am *well* acquainted with some persons, members of my own Diocese, whom report numbers among the supporters of the system which those writers recommend and uphold. And I bear my willing testimony to the *exemplary purity* of their lives, *their doctrine*, and *their opinions*." p. 37. The Bishop of Calcutta, however, does seem to use those same sad words in their full meaning. p. 43.

altogether an unnatural one; it was never meant, nor did he who first originated the idea of our Tracts, contemplate, that we should stand thus; we never wished to be leaders; he who has been forced into that unenviable eminence loved retirement and obscurity; we wished, as I said, to rouse, at a critical moment, the sense of our Church to the value of a part of her deposit which she was neglecting; our first Tracts were the short abrupt addresses of persons who, when the enemy was upon them, seize the first weapon which comes to hand and discharge it; our more elaborate ones grew under our hands and became such almost without our own will; we formed no system; we did nothing to gather people round ourselves; we besought others (though in vain) to preach in this place on the same doctrines, that those doctrines might not be identified with us; we wished to guide people away from ourselves, and pointed them on, and have been essaying to lead them, to the Ancient Church, in connection with our own; our publications of the Fathers, which had the sanction of your Grace and other your Brethren, had this as its main object, to present the fulness of the Ancient system, in faith and life, apart from modern statements and modern controversies; we forewent much which any of us might have desired to do, in order that the Church might be listened to, not ourselves; in whatever degree we have been made a party, it has been the

act of others not our own; we are held together not by party-ties but by our common Faith, and our common object of restoring our Church; we were formed in different ways [n], have retained the character impressed upon each, (which party obliterates,) and, while we hold the same Catholic truths, have, in some cases viewed men and actions differently; we have acted independently, one in this way, the other in that, as to each was given; we have vindicated prominently different portions of the Truth; we have adopted no characteristic practices; have revived nothing in common but the acknowledged practices of our Church; when people are compelled to leave declamation, and name our peculiar tenets, they find none which they can distinguish from those of our chief Divines; we have no title except one given in reproach by our opponents, and which is not unfrequently applied to your Lordships' body as well as to ourselves, whenever your acts bring out the character of the Church more than they approve of, who so designated us. We wish to be merged in our Church, to be nothing but what is of all the highest, Ministers and servants of our

[n] I may instance the remarkable history which one, not connected with the Tracts, has given of the way in which his present views were formed, against his own will; Letter to a Protestant-Catholic, by the Rev. W. Palmer, Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen, where he explains the anathemas which, in the first instance, from an apparent vehemence, gave pain, among others, to myself also.

God in her, " repairers of the breach, restorers of paths to dwell in[o]." But if we are thus singled out from the rest of our Lord's flock, as diseased and tainted sheep, who must be kept separate from the rest, lest we corrupt them; if a mark is thus set upon us and we are disowned, things cannot abide thus. For us, who are elder, it might be easy to retire from the weary strife, if it should be ever necessary, into lay-communion, or seek some other branch of our Church, which would receive us; but for the young, whose feelings are not bound up with their Church by the habits and mercies of many years, and to whom labouring in her service is not become a second nature, an element in our existence, their sympathies will have vent, and, if they find themselves regarded as outcasts from their Church—to a Church they must belong, and they will seek Rome. And yet, my Lord, this would be very miserable; they for whom I speak are not (as I have reason to think has been represented to one of your Lordships) unsubdued wilful young men, who at the first check which they receive from authority, are ready to fly off; it is not they who threaten secession, it is we who venture earnestly to state to your Lordships a secession with which they and we would be alike threatened. Among those, in whose minds serious misgivings have been raised, are not merely what would be

[o] Is. lviii. 12.

ordinarily called, "young men;" there are, one may say, some of the flower of the English Church; persons whose sense of dutifulness binds them to her, who would, to use the language of one of them, "feel it to be of course their duty to abide in her as long as they could." What we fear is not generally a momentary ebullition, but rather lest the thought of seceding from our Church should gradually become familiar to people's minds, and a series of shocks loosen their hold until at last they drop off, almost of themselves, from some cause which in itself seems wholly inadequate, because their grasp had gradually been relaxed before. What we fear is lest a deep despondency about ourselves and our Church come over people's minds, and they abandon her, as thinking her case hopeless; or lest individuals who are removed from the sobering influence of this ancient home of the Church, should become fretted and impatient at these unsympathising condemnations, and the continued harassing of the unseemly strife now carried on under the shelter of your Lordships' names, and losing patience should lose also the guidance vouchsafed to the patient.

What we crave, then, my Lord, is sympathy. While we cannot abandon what we believe to be true, we have ever been ready to acknowledge that prejudice may have been created against the truth by our imperfect modes of stating it. We must sorrowfully feel—there is much shame in making

this confession in behalf of others less imperfect than myself, yet all must feel painfully—that had they more of the Blessed Spirit of Truth, their teaching would more approve itself to be truth, since it would appear that it is "not they who speak but the Spirit of their Father which speaketh in" them. In part also a prejudice may have been created against the truths we taught, by our teaching them unsystematically; it has been said of us, that we were ourselves learning while we taught. This which must in some degree be true of all, may have been specially so of some of us; it hardly could be otherwise in recovering any body of doctrines which had been cast into the shade; people are led on step by step, until they in some measure see the whole. Your Grace will excuse my explaining what I mean by reference to myself, of whom one must know most. In writing my Tracts on Holy Baptism,—which I undertook not of my own mind but to rescue a pupil from falling into dissent,—wishing to comment upon all the texts of Holy Scripture relating to it, I was forced upon one, which impresses the character of grievous sin after Baptism. In writing upon it, I kept as much as possible to the language of the Ancient Church, saying little of my own, as fearful to trust myself[o]. What I wrote, I hope that with

[o] The same seems to have been the object of a very solemn sermon on the same subject recently published; "Evangelical Repentance" with an Appendix by the Rev. C. Wordsworth, in

deepening years I hold more deeply; and day by day shews me how needful the doctrine is for these times, that without it there can be no thorough restoration of our Church, nor high standard of holiness; but my statement was imperfect, as making no mention of the healing and comforting power of Absolution or the pardoning grace in the Holy Eucharist. I have since endeavoured to remove objections to my statement in my Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, and to supply what was wanting in University and other Sermons; the Tract itself has continued out of print for six years, because I have not had leisure to fill up what was wanting, and would not reprint it in a form in which I felt it to be imperfect. I have not to complain that what I wrote above six years ago still remains matter of animadversion; one is responsible for all one ever did. What I endeavoured to impress was truth, although not exhibited sufficiently in connection with other truth; I have reason even to think that in some cases the very nakedness with which it was first proposed, gave it the more entrance; the sterner voice awakened those, whom softer tones would not have reached: however, it was imperfect; I took advice in what I did; I have since done what I could to prevent a very solemn and Catholic truth, which lies at the

which he considers all the texts, which speak of "repentance," and refers to modern writers also. Its tone makes it one of the cheering signs of these times.

very foundation of repentance in most of us, from being injured by my imperfections; and it is matter of sorrow that some incorrect representation of my original statements, rather than acquaintance with those which I have since put forth, or with my practical teaching, was, in one of the Charges at least, the occasion of the animadversions. Thus, a Catholic truth seems to be objected to, not my imperfections in stating it.

It may naturally seem too much to ask of Bishops, pressed down as they are by their over-weighty Dioceses, to examine what one has spoken of as "nearly[p] one hundred Tracts, which have given occasion for almost an equal number of volumes in reply." But, my Lord, Bishops, in animadverting upon them, are looked upon as passing a sort of judicial sentence; their Charges are not merely pastoral advice to their own Clergy, to avoid such or such a mode of teaching; they are printed and circulated through the whole Church, and are regarded as their solemn opinion on them; they are quoted every where not on the particular points merely on which they touch, but as to the whole body of the teaching of the "Tracts." It is then nothing but simple justice to ask, nothing but what any judge in the passing matters of this world would do, that they should put themselves in possession of the whole subject. It surely is beforehand not improbable that they would find,

[p] Bp. of Durham, p. 15.

that what abstractedly seemed too strongly spoken, or to have a dangerous tendency, is qualified by our other teaching. The "Tracts for the Times" do not claim to be a body of divinity, complete in themselves; they are detached writings on distinct though connected subjects or doctrines, such as "the times" seemed most urgently to require; they do not pretend to exhaust the subjects which they treat on, much less to present them in all their bearings, or (which seems by some in this day to be required) to contain in one the whole body of Divinity, so that whatever is not in any place expressly stated, should therefore be accounted not to be held. Surely, then, within the body of the "Tracts" themselves, not insulated passages of single tracts, but the whole substance must be considered together, by any one who has so solemn an office to perform, as to pronounce what sounds like a judicial sentence. But further, though "the Tracts" were in the first instance mostly anonymous, (the writers, then, as younger men and mostly in no ostensible office in the Church, not wishing to put themselves forward as her advisers,) the chief writers and their other works are now generally known. There is then no ground for judging of them, apart from what the same writers have elsewhere said, and are known to have said. Thus, before these authors are accused of too great tenderness for Romanist errors, it would surely have been well to have examined one thoughtful work,

written expressly on the subject of Romanism [o], and certainly one of the ablest vindications of our own position relatively to it. Or, on a specific doctrine—it has been thought that our teaching on sin after Baptism would be "gloomy and cheerless [p]," that it would "tend to rob [q] the Gospel of the Blessed Jesus of much of that assurance of the riches of the goodness and mercy of God in Christ, which is its peculiar message—its glad tidings of great joy—'Come unto Me, all that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;'" that it would tend to lessen our sense of some sins, because less deadly than others [r]. Now before such condemnation is repeated, it is surely not too much to pray, that Bishops would examine our practical teaching. To speak of writers of the Tracts only, there are now three volumes of Sermons professedly by ourselves, expressly intended to exhibit our teaching practically [s], besides the six volumes printed by Mr. Newman. If our teaching in these is not of the character supposed,—and Mr. Newman has sermons expressly bearing upon the subject,—or again, if the doctrine of the Atonement be not withdrawn from sight, or again,

[o] Mr. Newman's Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism.

[p] Bp. of Ripon, p. 20.

[q] Bp. of Exeter, p. 82.

[r] ib. p. 83.

[s] See Preface to Plain Sermons, vol. 1.

since one has written a work on The Passion[1], which I will not trust myself to characterize, but which has already brought a holy peace to aching hearts, and will become one of the standard devotional books of our Church,—it will surely occur to them, at least to set down what they object to, to some imperfection of expression, rather than to unsoundness of doctrine, (which must most forcibly appear in practical teaching;)—perhaps it might lead them to think that the statements had not the meaning which they who censure them, had attached to them.

Another impression might perhaps result from this examination; and our Bishops themselves would be glad to find how small a proportion what they found themselves obliged to object to, bore to the whole mass of teaching. I do not say that these Bishops would acquiesce in, or have considered, all other points of teaching in our Tracts; I only mean, that the points actually animadverted upon—except by those altogether of a distinct school of theology, which itself, until of late years, found little favour in our Church—are both few, and do not touch on any Catholic truth, or any of the essentials of our teaching. They relate mostly to modes of statement, character of language, estimation of another Church, not to the main doctrines themselves. I certainly found with surprise as well as

[1] The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Passion harmonized, with reflections, by the Rev. Is. Williams.

satisfaction, amid the warnings of these Charges, how little altogether was condemned, and nothing essential; I think that they who are so eager to represent us as condemned, would, if they made the same analysis, think that they had little to boast of. Thus, besides the principle of the exposition of the Articles in Tract 90, the Bishop of Ripon blames my way of speaking of Sin after Baptism (which I have confessed imperfect), Reserve on the doctrine of Atonement, tenderness in speaking of Roman practices, too great strength of language as to tradition. The Bishop of Exeter spoke of the same four points, my own (I must say) compelled statements as to 'Prayers for those departed in the faith and fear of Christ,' which never formed part of our teaching; the sketch of a service in commemoration of Bp. Ken, which certainly was never used by any in common. The Bishop of Gloucester speaks but on Tract 90, on reserve and tradition, although the affliction, in which all must sympathize, may have prevented his acquainting himself with other points as well as our real meaning as to those on which he speaks. Even the Bishop of Winchester, although, estimating us by his school, he must also include the doctrine of Justification, speaks besides only of "reserve," the *mode* of speaking of tradition, language as to the Church of Rome, our own, our Reformers, our formularies, or that he thinks we hold the Sacraments to be "*the only* sources of Divine grace, to the exclusion

of any other"—none of these controverting or touching any doctrine we hold—I must add indeed one point, intelligible perhaps on his system, utterly unintelligible to me on the system which he opposes, viz. that our teaching "defaces the brightest glory of the Church, by forgetting the continued presence of her Lord;" whereas in effect the very characteristic of the Catholic system is to bear in mind the Presence of our Lord every where, in the Church, in worship, in Sacraments, in rites, in fast, in festival; it loves the Church, as His body; public worship the rather, because He is then more present; fasts, as fasting with Him; festivals and rites, because they speak of Him; Sacraments, as uniting with Him. It is the contrary naked system which does indeed "deface the glory of the Church," and makes her but an "element of this world," "forgetting the continued Presence of her Lord," in her and with her.

And since this is so, and one may claim without hesitation (though setting up no one as a standard except the Church), that our teaching is more in accordance with the acknowledged Divines of the 17th century,—I would not exclude in this respect even those of the 16th,—than that which opposes it, one may on this ground the rather hope that what is thought defective in us, will not be so spoken against, as to seem to condemn our teaching in its substantial parts. They who brand us with names of heresy have, through unacquaintance

doubtless, throughout avoided this question, whether the chief Divines of the 17th century are most with us or with them; of the 16th, they are diligent in pointing out against us the varying and unsatisfactory language on the one Sacrament, but take no heed to the clear and definite language of the same writers on the other; they claim single expressions in the Homilies, the body of Catholic teaching contained therein they neglect. Themselves holding with the Non-Conformists, and having learnt of them rather than of our Liturgy or the writers of our Church, agreeing with the writers neither of the 16th century nor, still less, of the 17th, they would gain a tacit admission for their own system by the condemnation of our's, and, themselves of yesterday in the Church, would condemn us for novel teaching.

And yet, my Lord, whatever our imperfections may be, it will be acknowledged that good service has been done. "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy Name be the praise," will be the confession of those who have been the chief agents in this work. They have gladly acknowledged that they sowed the seed on soil which God had prepared, had "made soft with the drops of rain, and blessed the increase of it;" they gladly recognise other men's labours, even when they deem their views imperfect, or in grave points erroneous; but still good service has been done; and since others seem to forget it, and even those who in some

degree acknowledge it, seem often not to be aware of any thing beyond matter of outward discipline and order, I may speak of it to your Grace; and that the more, since, as it is already appreciated, I have myself the least portion in it.

A great change then has come over our people; it is recognised on all hands that the Church is stronger; in a great political revolution some years past, her influences seemed to be paralyzed; since that time she has, under circumstances outwardly adverse, been steadily recovering it, and they who oppose her, acknowledged that, at the late crisis, it was her influence which decided it. And in what did that influence exist? Not in canvassing or partizanship, but in the silent power which her increased energy gave her over the minds of men, binding them to her. It were not seemly to speak disparagingly of times gone by; we have too much of them still cleaving to us, and, too probably, faults of our own besides; we had in those days also, men who will ever be remembered with veneration and love; still the tone of doctrine and the standard of life was on the whole low; we dare not blame them; they may have acted up to their standard, better than we to ours; we would rather confess "our sins and the sins of our forefathers," and thank God for having hitherto spared us. "Thy father's dishonour is no glory unto thee[s]." Yet in this spirit it may be confessed, that a

[s] Eccles. iii. 10.

secular temper came gradually over the Church during the last century, which was but little abated at the earliest part of this, and of which we have too many traces still; in earlier days one never heard of self-denial or any of the harder duties, even when collections were made for objects of charity; "sacrifices" was a name unknown; every thing was on an easy footing[t]; decency and propriety were the standards and substitutes for holiness; daily advancement seemed scarcely contemplated as possible; to live under rule was unthought of; fasting was apparently expiring, and hanging upon the lives of those elder members of families, who yet kept one or two of the most solemn yearly fasts; daily service was being fast given up, even in our towns, for want of worshippers; even in the resorts of those who had leisure, the very service in Lent was often broken in upon, because two or three could not be brought together; in the country Good-Friday itself was in whole districts neglected; Catechizing disused; what discipline we might

[t] "One only Way to life;
One Faith, delivered once for all;
One holy Band, endow'd with Heaven's high call;
One earnest, endless strife;—
This is the Church th' Eternal fram'd of old.

Smooth open ways, good store;
A creed for every clime and age,
By Mammon's touch new moulded o'er and o'er;
No cross, no war to wage;—
This is the Church our earth-dimm'd eyes behold."

Lyra Apostolica, No. xcviii.

exercise, and training of the young neglected; our people grew wild, and most of what was earnest in the lower ranks fell into dissent. In whole districts, to belong to a new zealous sect was the very badge of spiritual life, to belong to the Church was to be accounted lifeless. Communions were withdrawn from sight, and our "daily bread" offered perhaps twice or thrice in the year; more are thought to have commemorated His Precious Death, in sects who knew of no further blessedness in the Holy Eucharist, than in the Church which taught that thereby "He dwelleth in us and we in Him;" doctrine and practice declined together; the true doctrine was forgotten; the service became cold, and few came; religious fervour seemed to be out of the Church rather than within it; what would now seem almost laxity was then accounted to constitute men "saints;" religion was never spoken of, nor common topics spoken of religiously; our final account seemed to be forgotten among the one sort, in the other, a "judgment according to our works" was denied; measures of duty, teaching, ends, motives, hopes, seemed alike earthly, or, on the other hand, men were called upon to rely upon a Redeemer's Blood, without being taught *how* to "follow the blessed steps of His most holy life;" on one side was a foundation with nothing built thereon, on the other, a lowly building, well perhaps that it was so, since it had no foundation. Even they

who professed to be most unworldly, seemed to have their eyes fixed on some mere outward manifestations or haunts of worldliness, to be lopping some "uppermost branches," not laying the axe to the root; expediency was the standard of popular morality; religious education, Church-building and works of charity were at a stand, so that if any one gave on a larger scale, he became a sort of witness against the world; efforts for the conversion of the heathen were carried on more extensively by sects than by the Church; in-devotion was shewn by complaints of the length of the service; unspirituality by the continued proposals to alter it. In the state, our empire was our idol; while fifty millions were year by year expended on war, not one five-hundredth could be obtained for one year for a religious purpose; the preferment, as it was called, of the Church was matter of open state-negociation and bribery, so that a Minister of the Crown who disposed of it conscientiously, became, on this ground only, an object of admiration; we were ashamed to own in the presence of our heathen subjects that we were Christians, paid military respect to their idols, and denied our knowledge of our own God; the thought of sending out a Bishop to India produced a panic; he entered it almost as a thief; he who was to bear the banner of the Cross was "obliged to get him by stealth into the city" over which he was to preside, "as people being ashamed steal

away when they flee in battle;" at home, a celebrated statesman could venture to make it a ground of objection to a measure, that it would promote "too much religion," and was listened to; our very Clergy seemed often more afraid of "over-much" religion than of over-little; their own claims, when they felt them, they seemed mostly to rest on their education, their birth, their manners, their kindliness, any thing but the Apostolic Commission they bore from God; of their two great sections, the one seemed to maintain the skeleton of a traditional system, holding truth often as a negation of other truth, (as, baptismal regeneration to plead against the necessity of change in life;) the other, despairing that "these dry bones" could "live," betook themselves to a system foreign to our Church, formed themselves in the writings of the Non-conformists, and so were often themselves driven into dissent, finding their teaching akin to it, not to the formularies of the Church. They sympathized more with those without the Church than with those within, and were themselves, as they have sometimes owned, on the very verge of dissent. Of the Sacraments, to use the language of an elder, familiar with this school, "the one was denied, the other regarded as a means of religious excitement." One must even fear that the dislike and disuse of the Athanasian Creed argued a deeper disease than the unwillingness to take up its anathemas, since one heard at

the same time of the simplicity of the Christian religion, its reasonableness, in other words, its want of Mystery.

One may recite all this, which is only a specimen of much more that remains untold, though one must recite it with aching heart and shame of face, as they who have been "snatched out of the burning;" still, since we have been so snatched, it may be recited without fearing that it is the sentence of our condemnation. Even yet it is "the day of small things;" but since our trust is not in ourselves, but in Him Who hath "given us repentance unto life," we may take courage. Beginnings are being made every where. Nothing is as it should be; but every thing, we may trust, is set in a course whereby it may hereafter become such. Devotion, charity, self-denial, the three great classes of duties as our Lord enjoins them, are increasing; our Churches are better attended; our Communions more frequent, our Communicants increased and more devout; daily service is creeping even into our villages: whereas the service seemed long, some are now looking back with yearning for the fuller services of the Ancient Church; the hours, whereby she kept her Lord ever in her eye, are being restored; the weekly commemoration of His Passion is finding its way among the sons and daughters of even our rich and great; and, with fasting, simple habits, and more self-denying ways, and charity, are being restored; Lent

and the season of The Passion are more realized; the mysteriousness of our Christian life, as having "by Baptism put on Christ," is more felt; our future account more apprehended and brought to bear upon daily life; the bearing of the Cross more taught, and in some degree practised; repentance and humiliation deepened; obedience and submission more recognised and rendered; designs to God's glory and man's good commenced on a more self-denying scale; the education of the poor and the building of Churches carried on with more individual exertion and sacrifice, even while the efforts and means of Societies are enlarged; nobler plans, like that of some years past for the Metropolitan Churches, the Extension of Education, our Colonial Bishoprics, devised and in part executed, and some of them giving birth to kindred efforts; the privileges bestowed on us in our Church more carried into life[u]; those without, wherever

[u] The Bishop of Winchester mentions some of these changes, as a blessing attendant upon the "going forth of the word of God in all its freedom and integrity, building up the individual members of the flock in the principles of our most holy faith, and shielding them with the doctrine and discipline of the Church." Among other points he mentions, "Dissent stayed; the Liturgy more highly appreciated; respect for the ordinances increasingly cultivated; the Sacraments duly estimated; Baptism honoured in the presence of the Church, and the pleading for the mercies of the covenant promised by our Lord Jesus Christ in His Gospel; more frequent biddings to the Holy Communion; fewer refusals; a less chilling negligence, and a return to a better mind on the part of them that are bidden, and an approach

she is planted, in this country, in the United States, and even in Scotland, recognising her more and more as a Church, and coming over to her, not for her respectability in the sight of man, but as the building, the ordinance, the body, of Christ; even foreign Churches, long unknown or estranged from, or even now persecuting us, yet still at least

to something of godly discipline in the Christian family and Christian community; catechetical teaching rendered interesting, and appreciated by parents and children; the rite of confirmation rescued from the disgrace of unmeaning profession or formal ignorance;—the recognition of a purer standard of holiness; of the details of Christian duty; of the obligations of the Divine law; of the doctrine of love to God and man in all its enlarged bearings; a way of holiness opened, of holy worship and of holy conversation." (p. 40, l.) Acknowledging gladly the services of the section of the Church which opposes us, and without, in an unseemly way, contending that these blessings have been ministered by their Author through our hands, one might yet ask who is most likely to have been instrumental in them, they who are reproached for over-valuing Ordinances, the Sacraments, the Church and her discipline, or they who so reproach them? one might ask, in matter of fact, which section of our Church has, on the whole, gone most into the "details of Christian duty" or "the obligations of the Divine law," they who are blamed as "legalists" or they who blame them? by which the services of the Church have been most restored? One might ask in the Bishop's own language, which of the two sections would be likely most to "shield persons with the doctrine and *discipline* of *the Church?*" It is distasteful to say this, but it seems required in justice to our principles not to ourselves, since the Bp. of Durham thinks that all had always been going on well, (Charge, p. 10, 11.) the Bp. of Calcutta that this re-awakening was independent of our principles, (Sermon, p. 61.) both agree that we have been but thwarting it.

beginning to suspect that we are a Church, and to have a respect for us and sympathy with us; and within ourselves, there is, one should trust, on the whole, not self-complacency at our progress, which might mar all, but rather an increasing humiliation; with our renewed life, we seem to have become (as must be, in whatever degree it is a life from God) more conscious of the remaining death, the body of death wherewith we are surrounded; we seem to be looking more longingly back to that high standard, which the Ancient Church had, and to be mourning that we are not like her. Our very distractions are a proof of zeal, though we have not as yet the love, which would enable us to understand each other, and prejudice sometimes seems to deprive us of the very wish to do so, yet it is in many a zeal for God's honour, which will in the end be directed aright, even though for the time it is "ignorantly" opposing the truth, whose features have not been enough disclosed for them to recognise; there is a longing after unity, and prayer for it, to which one must hope it will at length be given.

I said, my Lord, that "we were but one small link in the vast chain of means and effects whereby God is working for His Church what He willeth." I shall not therefore be suspected of claiming for ourselves an undue share in this great work. The change, although more marked of late, was not of yesterday or of the last few years. Spring has not

at once followed upon winter; much of the chillness of that past season gradually relaxed. Some of the evils, which I have mentioned as characteristic of it, were lessened long since. The section of the Church, which thinks itself most opposed to us, did much in its day to restore religious earnestness and devotion; much was done in a more tranquil way, by some in your Lordships'[x] station, or by those in our own who handed down to our times the principles now put forward more prominently; we "entered into other men's labours," as others, we trust, will reap where we have sown; during these years also in which we have been employed, we have been all along but working together with others in their different spheres, as writers or Parochial Ministers, holding the same general principles, but formed independently of us, by the Same Lord, Who gave us our work. Still it is acknowledged that many have been stirred up by the writings, which have come forth from this place; the new life which has from Above been infused into our Church, has of late taken a form in accordance with the principles of our Church, as they have been set forth here; persons who as yet stop short of doctrines which in the name of our Church we have taught, still own themselves indebted to us for shewing them the nature of that Church, and teaching

[x] e. g. Bp. Porteus.

them Apostolic order; and since it is said "by their fruits ye shall know them," one may cheerfully appeal to the improved tone in the youth committed to the care of our Mother here, in proof of the value of principles, which have brought forth the fruits of good living, obedience, reverence, devotion.

It is felt by those who do not receive some of our statements of doctrine that we have yet on the whole been working in the line of our Church; let this be acknowledged openly, and we shall not be anxious about the effects of any remarks or censures upon us in detail; we will receive them gratefully; since although founded, we must think, on misapprehension of our teaching, our being misapprehended may teach us humility and caution; they may warn us against deviations, into which if (as we trust) we have not fallen, we may yet guard against more diligently; they may remind us the more that the path of true doctrine also is narrow, so may we seek more lowlily and warily to walk in it. Only, not for our sakes but for the very object which your Lordships have in view, to win those whom you would caution,—may I be permitted to add, that any acknowledgment would seem more gracious and be more effective, if bestowed as thanks for services rendered, rather than as it has mostly been, to take off the edge of some censure?

III. Thus far, my Lord, I have felt myself more at liberty to write fully, because personal explanations are the more allowed, as conveying information which those who make them can alone convey. It may seem, perhaps, less permitted to me, to trouble your Grace upon subjects of the Church which have no immediate relation to ourselves; yet here too, I would wish to be considered as giving your Grace information, as to the effects which a certain course of action might have on a large body of individuals within our Church.

The subject to which I wish to advert is our relation to foreign bodies; and it is right, not to conceal from your Grace that circumstances connected with the plan of sending a Bishop of the English Succession to Jerusalem, have awakened very deep and serious misgivings in the minds of those who can best judge of the state of feeling among us, and, I must add, latterly in my own. Our stability, my Lord, at present seems to depend in great measure, upon our remaining where we are. Many persons, whose minds had become disquieted about our Church, have, even when not set wholly at rest, yet come at least to the result, that unless our Church be committed to any thing wrong, it is their duty to remain within her, and see what God will do for her. They would even think it undutiful to imagine beforehand any case, which would compel them to abandon her, as a child would shrink from contemplating that its parent would commit a sin, which should compel it

to leave her roof. I have good hopes, that if no organic change be made in our Church, no authoritative explanation on the wrong side placed upon our Articles, and she be committed to no heresy or fresh schism, though we may have to mourn, as we have mourned, over some sorrowful secessions, yet the main body of our Church will be more stayed within her, as year by year, God's hand more visibly prospers her, and she yields more signs of a living Church. To this end, however, it is of the first importance that men's minds should be at rest; calmness is essential to our seeing the truth, since the Spirit of Truth is the Spirit of peace also, and a disturbed mind cannot reflect Him; but people's minds will not be calm, if things around them seem in a course of change, they know not whither. So long as we simply develope our own Church, and bring out her character more fully, as is the tendency of the Colonial Bishoprics, this is well; it is a sign the more of life. But any step which has a tendency to bring her into relations with foreign un-Catholic bodies, will be unsettling. Any advance to Protestantism will produce a counter-movement towards Romanism.

Your Grace will permit me the rather to explain myself with regard to the new Bishopric at Jerusalem, because I myself at first viewed the plan with interest, having received an erroneous impression with regard to it, and so I may perhaps explain not only the feelings of those who sympathize in it, how far they do sympathize, but what their

fears are, who dread it; and this it may be the more desirable for your Grace to know, since it will appear, I imagine, for the most part, that those sympathies and those fears relate to different objects; that the fears have sunk far more deeply and extended more widely than your Grace has been led to imagine; and that others' sympathies are not engaged in that part of the scheme, from which alone any of us fear.

I was then at first led to imagine that there was already a Church of Jewish Converts and of English at Jerusalem, and that the Bishop was to be sent over primarily for their sake. This seemed to me a legitimate object; for since people who spoke different languages, though living together, were allowed by the ancient rule, each to enjoy the blessing of a Bishop, there seemed no reason why Jewish Converts should be obliged to use a ritual in a language they did not understand, or be placed under a Bishop, of another nation and speech; there seemed no reason why the Hebrew Psalms should not be once more sung in a Church at Jerusalem, and those who used the Hebrew ritual, be gathered under a Bishop of their own nation. It was also a thing allowed in early times, that one Bishop should enter into a district nominally in the diocese of another, in order to convert Heathen, whom the other failed to win. Viewed then as a Missionary Bishop, whose office was confined to the Jews, there seemed to me no principle

opposed to such an appointment. Again, if Prussians, owing no obedience to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, placed themselves under our Bishop, neither did this (whatever my judgment may have been) seem to me a dangerous measure. I hoped that they would be absorbed into our Church, to which they had united themselves, and gradually imbibe her spirit and be Catholicized. I trusted to the Catholicity of our Church to win those who were brought within the sphere of her influence, the more powerful and the higher principle ever assimilating to itself the weaker and lower. But now that various competent authorities combine to state, that the Congregation at Jerusalem consists of but very few, (more than one traveller has stated its amount at about four,) the case is widely different. The whole is an experiment, and that in so serious a thing as a Christian Church. The mingled Church to be formed under our Bishop, of Lutherans and Jewish converts, has been truly though painfully, designated, "an Experimental Church." And what an experiment! to bring together persons, one knows not whom, sound or unsound, pious or worldly, bound together by no associations, accustomed to no obedience, who on the very Lord's Day have practically but one service[y], and scarcely any through the year besides,

[y] The service in the afternoon is identically the same as the morning, and is attended by different members of the same congregation. Even religious persons, or preachers, where there are

never kneel in the public worship of God, sitting when they sing their hymns, standing when they receive the Holy Eucharist,—under Pastors, *consenting* to receive Episcopal Ordination, but not, as themselves contend, valuing it—if this may even be without profanation,—and make ourselves responsible for them, and exhibit these as specimens of the English Church to the Greek Communion, which has just heard again of us, and is beginning to value us. To think, for the time, only of its effect on the Orthodox Greek communion, (apart from the graver and deeper question of the responsibility we should ourselves incur,) what suspicion must needs be cast upon us, that we thus, in their very presence, sanction bodies whom they have anathematized, not incorporating them into ourselves nor infusing into them our principles, but joined in a sort of outward alliance with them, each pursuing its distinct course, worshipping in its own way, except that their Ministers would receive Episcopal Ordination, and engraft the Thirty-nine Articles on the Confession of Augsburg, without our Catholic Liturgy, whereby to interpret them, and accepting either *in so far as* (quatenus) they individually found them to correspond with *their* views of Holy

more than one in a place, do not think of going to the second service. The writer, many years ago, on attending it, was told by an eminent preacher that it was not meant for him; i. e. the instruction then given was of a simpler sort, for the poor; and there seemed to be no thought that any one could come a second time to Church, but for the instruction.

Scripture. What an outward and unspiritual view of a Church and of Episcopacy would it seem to imply us to hold, who could think that such a juxta-position of discordant elements under the—one cannot say government but the—presidency of our Bishop, could constitute a Church!

It would be making ourselves responsible, in the eyes of Christendom,—not to speak now of the Eye of God,—for bodies different from our own, over whom we should have no influence, of whose faith we have no guarantee, of whose life we have no previous knowledge, except that we know that faith in Germany has been miserably shaken, that the self-discipline which our Church enjoins is there unknown and unthought of.

Again, still to think only of its effects externally to ourselves, we should have no safeguard that the Bishop so sent, or Congregations so formed, shall not proselytize or consent to receive proselytes from the Orthodox Communion. It is not many years, I think, since a report of the Society for the Conversion of the Jews published at the other University spoke of the ill-success in its proposed object, but seemed to think the opportunity of preaching the Gospel to the Greeks no small compensation. The conversion of Jew, Turk, and Orthodox Greek, seemed to them a like object. I know not whether the Church Missionary Society, which your Grace has now sanctioned, have yet withdrawn its Mis-

sionaries from the same Church, which it openly acknowledged were opposed by the spiritual authorities, but boasted that they were gladly heard by the people. Similar language has been unhappily and is heard elsewhere. But any attempts at "conversion," or connivance in persons forsaking the orthodox communion wherein they were baptized, besides encouraging sin, must immeasurably delay the prospect of union with that communion. We ourselves know the bitterness of losing our own children, which a rival communion is stealing from us. Are we to think the sorrows of another Mother, when bereaved, less than our own? We should definitely fix our own principles. Our Bishop cannot at once promote union and schism; we cannot at once conciliate the parent, and rob her of her children; be a friend and an enemy. We must either rigidly prescribe to ourselves our own bounds and remain with them, or give up the opening prospect of ultimate union. We cannot treat the Orthodox Greek Church, at once as orthodox and heterodox; orthodox in that we think union justifiable, heterodox, since heresy alone can justify secession. This re-opened intercourse with the East is, as your Grace will feel, a crisis in the history of our Church. It is a wave which may carry us onward, or, if we miss it, it may bruise us sorely and fall on us, instead of landing us on the shore. The union or disunion of the Church for centuries may depend on the wisdom

with which this providential opening is employed. If the ways which He makes for us are neglected, we may long essay in vain to attain in our own, what in His would have been easy, since He would "make them plain before our face." In proportion to the greatness of the blessing held out to us, must be our anxiety lest we miss it. It stirs the heart and makes one, like Jacob, almost disbelieve for fear, that such an event as the reunion of our Church with a sound branch of the Church Catholic should be open to us; alas! considering what we actually are, it makes us fear lest it cannot indeed be meant for us, and as though it were not in any temper which we can in this day claim, amid mutual self-complacency, but in weeping and sackcloth and ashes that the breaches of our brotherly union are to be healed. "Joseph made himself known to his brethren and he wept aloud—and he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept, and Benjamin wept upon his neck. Moreover he kissed all his brethren and wept upon them." But, whether this union may now be hoped, or whether what we witness be but the first pale streaks of such a morning of joy, enough for our eyes to behold, only be the delay not brought about by any errors of our own. Yet in proportion to the value of the gift, may we be sure that Satan will interpose hindrances to our attaining it, that it will be beset with snares.

But this is looking far; and my excuse for

troubling your Grace are our dangers in our own home. Our repose at home, humanly speaking, depends, as I ventured to say, on our remaining as we are. Persons are very sensitive about the character of our Church. They have felt keenly the parallel which Romanists are so fond of making between us and the Donatists. It does not indeed hold, inasmuch as that was a sect which, confined within its petty communion, called itself alone *the* Church, and condemned the Church Universal. We have no Church Universal against us; the Greek Church which has anathematized the Lutherans and Calvinists, has spared us; we have hitherto had the Latin Church against us, although we have not rejected its Communion, but been cast off by it; if we voluntarily add the Eastern, we shall have the whole. Nor must one conceal that there is much of this Donatist temper about individuals, and that the self-satisfied spirit of our people has crept into our Church, and they seem to say to all other Churches, "Stand back, for I am holier than thou." And, amid our intestine divisions, disagreed among ourselves what the doctrines of our Church are, even as to the very Sacrament whereby persons are made members of it, they would make converts to—they know not, at least are not agreed, what! Such proceedings must be very fatal to our humility; they were to that of Rome, when it had far more pretensions than we now have, and had a far more righteous cause,

and was the bulwark of the Orthodox Faith. It tended to her fall; and we dare not think that, with our miserable disunion and want of discipline, we may, with her, neglect the Apostolic advice, and "be high-minded" and yet be safe, when she fell. But, immediately, in our own day, any exhibition of ourselves as a proselytizing Church would unsettle many of our own children to a fearful extent. Grasping at the shadow which does not belong to us, we should lose what we already have; we should receive the requital, "as thou hast done, so be it done unto thee," we should receive the reward of the spoiler, and be ourselves spoiled[x].

Another source of danger, strongly felt by persons well acquainted with the East, and whose judgment your Grace would value, is any thought of involving ourselves with Monophysites or any heretical sect. And this is no imaginary danger; if Bishop Heber was deceived, much more might one, who himself was not educated in our Faith, nor trained in our Theology. They are described to us by those who know them, as a subtle people, too well versed in their own unhappy heresy, even as a madman acquires a miserable ingenuity in supporting the one hypothesis upon which his disease turns. The Christian Church has been more than once almost deceived by an ambiguous confession,

[x] Is. xxxiii. 1.

and that, when they were exercised by the heresy which was covered by it; how much more readily we, who have been so long spared it! Yet your Grace will readily feel how shocking it would be to be thus brought close within the touch of heresy; you will feel how painfully it would distress men's minds, what a mark it would be against our Church, if she were any way committed to it.

And although one would not confuse the Lutheran body with these heretics, still much danger would result from any step which would tend to identify us with them, or which implied that we adopted their formulæ as our own. I have readily owned that we owe a duty to them; I trust that it is reserved for us, hereafter, safely to supply what is lacking to them, and join them on with ourselves in visible unity with the Church Universal; but to effect this, we must draw them back to ourselves and the Ancient Church, not lean over to them. It has been gladdening to see a partial restoration of Christianity from its prostration at the close of the last, and the beginning of the present century; it has been saddening that it has been but partial; there is more of imperfect life than, fifteen years past, any one would have dared to hope, less of complete soundness. It is probably always so, in Churches and individuals; the scars of our wounds abide, even when we are in a degree restored; some effects of men's sins remain, even after their repentance has long continued. Perfect

soundness does not follow quickly upon deep disease. Neologism (as your Grace well knows) had preyed deeply into the very vitals of the German Theology of the last century. A talented writer, who has been one great instrument in its restoration, could say, "If[a] from reading *any*[b] of the more recent periodicals one passes suddenly to those of the beginning of this century, one feels one's self at once in a wholly different atmosphere. *From a battle-field one enters within the still Church-yard.* The sun of 'enlightened times' having once emerged above the horizon, its rays travel in peaceful repose over field and village, and the Theologians[c] had only to survey the bloodless victories. Here and there an old supernaturalist starts up—but the conqueror, in full security, can afford to be generous; old Time with his scythe is ready, as the ally of 'enlightenment,' to lay in the dust the aged orthodox heads of the Church.—Had things remained thus, could Theology have existed on for fifty years, without dying of very weariness[d]?" From this deathsleep, which this

[a] Tholuck, Litterarischer Anzeiger, 1836, No. 15.

[b] i. e. Rationalist or other.

[c] i. e. the then Theologians,—the Rationalists.

[d] Shortly after Gabler is instanced with praise, as an exception to his day, because he was in earnest about something, even in maintaining the truths of natural religion. "The earnestness with which he comes forward [against the Pantheistic Philosophy of Schelling] deserves respect; one sees that he has it really at heart, not to allow 'the principles of

writer describes with such true though indignant irony, Protestant Germany was awakened by another battle-cry, its sufferings in the war of 1813—15. The scourge of Europe brought some humbler and chastened thoughts. Yet even in 1825, a theologian, in recounting the Professors who could any how be considered orthodox,—i. e. those who in any contended for the doctrines of the Gospel or its very truth,—counted, in all Protestant Germany, 17; the miracles of our Lord were still, here and there, explained away by the teachers of youth; some of those in the Old Testament were even ridiculed, both were disbelieved by many who were afterwards to be Preachers. They are denied, to this day, by some of the Professors in Prussia itself. Since that time, the hand of God has indeed been with them; it has been "the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes;" but from a state of things when Rationalism ruled with a scarcely-disputed sway, to one in which the full Faith of Nicæa shall be received in its integrity—this were such a mighty change, such fullness of life from such completeness of death, that your Grace may well think it subject of enquiry, not whether the three Creeds still stand in the books of their Confession, but whether they are still confessed from the heart, undisputed and unqualified, as saving truth, in the same sense in which they were and are

natural religion' to be cut away from under him. In this dead time Gabler is altogether a sort of theological character."

in all branches of the Church Catholic. Important as Episcopacy is in the maintenance of what is good, there are, in the present state of the German Protestants, things of far more importance than Episcopacy; Episcopacy might, under God, have saved them from this downfall, but it may not be the first in order, in rearing them up; in order to benefit them at all or not to injure them, it may require a certain character corresponding to it. We have ourselves seen, in the experience of the Scotch Church, how little available the establishment of Episcopacy was, in the absence of certain conditions on the part of those who were to receive it; in its present rise and solid progress, we see its inherent power, amid outward pressure or desertion, where those conditions are found. And yet, to produce this state, it pleased God, as it seemed, almost to undo our work, that He might bring it about in His; He employed what was good in the Scotch Church, as the means of purifying and restoring her; He rent from her all human aid, left her to be trodden under foot of men, to be persecuted by the state, almost forgotten by ourselves; but a silent witness to truths which were fading among us; and now by a century of severe oppression and privation He has moulded our premature work to be the fit instrument of His Providence. Yet Scotland never was what Protestant Germany has been, or is. Unbelief had then never yet organized itself within a body

bearing the Name of Christ. God gave us, in this instance, a solemn warning how we imparted His gift. To bestow it at present on the German bodies, may be, indefinitely to retard its healthful or extensive influence. It is not yet longed for. The gift of Episcopacy would be no real gift to them unless they long for it; it is not the piety of one Monarch which can make the people fit to receive it; nor dare we entrust so sacred a deposit to any one; sincerum est nisi vas—; with soundness of faith Episcopacy would be a blessing, without it, it may be a curse; it is perhaps not without some ruling of Providence, that they who once professed their value for Episcopacy, as their faith declined, became indifferent to it, when they might have had it; they may have been withheld from that, which they were not fitted to receive. I myself had reason deeply to value and to love, now many years past, several of those who were employed in the restoration of religion in Prussia; I watched, for some time, with deep interest, though mingled sorrow, the struggles to a better state; every thing of a deeper sort, there as here, tending to restoration,—but there, unhappily, not of a perfect soundness of faith, but of Christianity itself. With much to respect, much to love, there seemed always some flaw. They have but lately recovered Christianity;—rather Christianity and Infidelity in its extremest form of Pantheism, are still struggling for the mastery in the minds of their

very teachers,—what they have recovered they have recovered in an imperfect form; in the minds of some of the younger men, (corresponding to what has taken place among ourselves,) a longing for a Church has been awakened; and so we may hope that this comes from the Same Hand; let this be cherished; pray we for its growth; it may be but waiting for some years,—as God is guiding things with His mighty Arm—and we may be fitter to impart, they to receive; we may exhibit more of a model, than, amid our present confusion and disagreement as to the first principles of our Church and our practical contradictions or neglect of them, we now do; they be more in a temper to copy what in us is sound and Catholic, when they see it more fulfilled in life. If, as has been said, "Episcopacy is the principle of stability, maintaining each body in the condition in which it is," the premature gift may be an injury; it may be but a perpetuation of error. There is, at present, even in the sounder part of the Luthero-Calvinist body, not a vestige, among its writers, of the first condition of a sound restoration,—humility; there is rather an arrogant exaltation of their own body, as the Mother of all in the West separate from Rome; an assumed superiority to our Church, not an acknowledgment of their own defects; the few who look for Episcopacy seem to desire it, in order to organize their imperfections, not to correct them; the most religious of their theological organs

declare against the Catholic view of it; they distinctly tell us that it is looked upon not as any thing spiritual, but as an outward mechanism; they tell us that the people desire it not; they refute the notion (and with good ground) that any changes recently proposed among themselves are any symptoms of such longing; there has been the wish to extend Presbyterian ordination, where now there is none; no desire of Episcopal[a]. It is for your Grace and your Grace's brethren to consider, how, in such a state of mind, you could, without risk of profanation, entrust a gift of the Holy Ghost, which is undesired, set at nought, repudiated, by those who are to receive it.

But, for ourselves, your Grace will permit me to say, that until—not their mere willingness to receive Episcopacy, but—their soundness is ascertained, it would be very injurious to ourselves, to become the source of a heterodox succession. To become responsible for heterodoxy in others is too much akin to being such ourselves. Our Bishops in the last century required that the Church of the United States should use the Nicene Creed in its devotions, before they would consent to consecrate Bishops for it; this secured, as far as might be, that that Church should believe the Faith which she weekly confessed to Almighty God; mere subscription, as is now spoken of, among those accustomed as the Lutherans have unhappily been,

[a] See Note B at the end.

to express, by subscription, only a partial assent, would not. There is no security that in subscribing the Creeds they would adopt them in the sense of the Church Catholic, not as they were qualified in their own minds. Your Grace will excuse my adding, that any recognition of any Lutheran formula, as that of the Confession of Augsburg, which, while in some points more definite than our own Articles would alone be, still expresses other things unsoundly and implies much more, would have a very distracting effect on the minds of many members of our Church, and indeed is such a measure as one sees not how any portion of our Church, even her highest Order, if they were unhappily agreed, could be justified in taking in the name of the whole Church.

I had ventured to write thus much to your Grace, before the official account of the English Bishopric at Jerusalem was published, and I retain it the rather, as containing a general statement of the views of others and myself, without any reference to the specific statement of your Grace. It is with satisfaction that I find the principles of non-interference with the Orthodox Greek Church are distinctly recognised, all proselytising strictly forbidden[a], the desire of ultimate union expressed,

[a] "The Bishop is specially charged not to entrench upon the spiritual rights and liberties of those Churches, but to confine himself to the care of those over whom *they* cannot rightfully claim any jurisdiction." Statement, p. 6. The Church of Rome

"healing of schisms" set forth as an object, a "longing for a renewal of the ancient affection," and this with "ancient and Apostolic Churches" and consequently not with the heretical bodies. Your Grace also contemplates the exhibition of "the spectacle[b] of *a* [one] Church, freed from the errors [of the heretical bodies] and imperfections [of 'the ancient Churches of the East'] and holding a pure faith in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace;" your Grace speaks of subjects of H. M. The king of Prussia, "joining[c] themselves to *the* Church so formed at Jerusalem," of "presenting[d] to the observation" of the ancient Churches of the East "the pattern of *a* Church essentially scriptural in doctrine, and apostolical in practice."

The object then which your Grace seems to have at heart is the exhibition of the one English Branch of the Church Catholic; and to this I conclude that your Grace hopes that the Prussian congregations will, if indulged in the use of their own services for a while, gradually assimilate themselves, and become one with it. I own I cannot myself be sanguine about the effects of the exhibition of our English Church,

is blamed in the same place for "sowing disorder and dissension amongst an ill-informed people," which would of course equally apply to the Missionaries of any Society which should set the people against its spiritual rulers, much more, seduce it from them.

[b] Ib. p. 3.

[c] Ib. p. 2.

[d] Ib. p. 6.

until she realizes in practice what your Grace in theory describes and longs that she may be. Amid her notorious neglect of fasting, the infrequency of her Communions, and the neglect of her daily service, I fear she will little impress upon the "ancient Churches of the East" her adherence to the "Apostolic practice," when, in the Holy City, they "held fast to the Apostles' fellowship, and to breaking of bread, and to prayer,—continuing *daily* with one accord in the temple:" I fear, until she become other than for some time she has been, she can be no spectacle of a Church "holding the faith in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace;" at least, although one trusts that there is vivid life, unity and peace seem the last characteristics one should have selected for our Church at home.

Still less, I own, can I see,—even if your Grace were advised, or it were lawful[e], to free the Bishop from those obligations by which he is at present bound,—how the picture of an united Church could be presented by an English and Lutheran congregation, of which the one holds "One Holy Catholic Church, throughout all the world," knit together by its Bishops, as "joints and bands," under its One Head, CHRIST, and joined on by unbroken

[e] See the very clear pamphlet, "The Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem considered in a Letter to a Friend," by J. R. Hope, B.C.L. Scholar of Merton, Chancellor of the Diocese of Salisbury.

succession to the Apostles; the other, an indefinite number of Churches[f], hanging together by an agreement[g] in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, and modified by the civil power[h]: of which the one holds Confirmation to be the act of the Bishop, the other deems such unnecessary but accepts it for its younger members[i]: the one holds Ordination to be derived from the Apostles; the other, that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred, may consecrate the Holy Eucharist: the one recites the Creed of Nicæa, the other has laid it aside[k]: in the one, ancient prayer, the inspired Psalms, and hearing God's Word, are the chief part of their weekly service; in the other, uninspired hymns and preaching, with prayer extempore; the one kneel in prayer, the other not even at the Holy Eucharist: with the one, the Lord's Day is a Holy Day, with the other a holyday: the one receives "the Faith" as

[f] Confession of Augsburg, Art. 1. "The Churches among us teach."

[g] "For the true Unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree as to the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." Ib. Art. 7.

[h] As in the union of the Lutheran and Reformed bodies.

[i] "The rite of Confirmation will be administered by the Bishop to the Catechumens of the German Congregations, according to the form used in the English Church." Statement of proceedings, p. 9.

[k] It does not always recite even the Apostles' Creed. See Note B.

"once for all delivered to the saints;" the other, as susceptible of subsequent correction and developement: the one rests her authority and the very titles of her existence on being an Ancient Church, the other boasts itself modern: the one, not founded by man, but descended of that founded on the Day of Pentecost; the other dating itself truly from Luther, and claiming to be the parent of all, not in outward communion with the great Eastern and Western Branches, and so of our own Church by whom it was originally converted: the one recognises[i] and has been recognised[j] by the Ancient Church of the East, the other rejects her and is anathematized by her[k]. Still less is there any hope, that by receiving Ministers ordained by our Bishop, they express any wish to be received into our Church, or become one with her. On the contrary, the divergence must be still greater, since they in whom these discordant elements are found, are each anxious to develope its own peculiar character. Your Grace expresses the hope that this Bishopric "may lead the way to an essential unity of discipline as well as doctrine between our own Church and the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant

[i] "Letter commendatory from the most Rev. The Lord Abp. of Canterbury," published in the "Statement of proceedings, &c." p. 17.

[j] See instances in Mr. Palmer on the Church, p. 1. c. 9. sect. 1.

[k] Synod of Bethlehem, A. D. 1672. see at length, Aids to Reflection, &c. by Rev. W. Palmer, Magd. Coll.

Churches of Europe," i. e. that they will be one Church, through the absorption of the Lutherans into our Church, and the reception, on their part, of all those things for lack of which they are at present "imperfect." Their view is wholly different; they look to this same event, only as an aggrandizement of their own body, as "securing to the Evangelical Church of the German nation,"—not as "less perfectly constituted" but—"*as*[l] *the Mother of all Evangelical Confessions*, rights commensurate to its greatness, beside the Latin and Greek Churches;" they look to it as an occasion for developing the German Evangelical Church, according to "*the Confession*[m], and with *the use of the liturgy*, of that Church;" and not only so, but they look upon the diversities of Christian worship, as immutable, inalienable; such diversities, *among Protestant bodies*, belong to the very principle of unity, and are looked upon as upheld by our Blessed Lord Himself. "The diversities," it is said[n], "of Christian worship, according to tongues and races, and according to the peculiarities and historical developement of each nation—that is to say in the Evangelical Church, are upheld by a higher unity,—the Lord of the Church Himself."

With these respective principles and aims, I see

[l] "Prussian State-paper to all the Royal governments," reprinted and translated by Mr. Hope, p. 77.

[m] "Prussian State-paper to all Royal Consistories," ib. p. 76.

[n] Ib. p. 74.

not any hope that the Lutheran emigrants will ever become true members of our Church, or that this outward union of bodies of them under a Bishop of our succession can do other than add one fresh element to our present confusions at home, give another subject of disquiet to those ill at ease, when what we so much need is rest and peace; retard the settlement of those questions among ourselves, on which our mutual misunderstandings are shaking our Church so dangerously; delay indefinitely the very objects we long for,—the conversion of the Jews, and re-union with the Orthodox Church of the East.

A happy pause, I trust, has now been given to our Church; the first step,—which would in itself, I believe (although not without anxieties) command the sympathies of all,—the consecration of a Bishop to represent our ancient British Church in the city of the Holy Sepulchre, has been taken; and although the Church might naturally have looked that so solemn an act should have been done in the name of the whole Church, that if we did send a Bishop to that blessed Place, he might have gone with the longings and prayers of all, not have been sent with the concurrence of five or six of our Bishops only, still, thus far, nothing has been absolutely done, which need in itself cause anxiety. Difficulties seem to have been providentially interposed to arrest

things just at this point[n], where they may be done without any compromise of our Church, and safely, if but wisely, executed. We may look with comfort and hope to an act, which again gives us an interest and a portion in the Holy Sepulchre, and unites around it representatives of the three branches of the Church Catholic. For ourselves, (in whom probably there exists a livelier interest in

[n] Mr. Hope's valuable pamphlet shews very solidly, that Bp. Alexander is a Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, bound by her Canons, Articles, Rubrics; under canonical obedience to her Metropolitan; that he is prohibited by his oath at Consecration, from ordaining any Clergy except as Clergy of our Church, using her Liturgy, her Catechism, "ministering the doctrine and Sacraments and discipline of Christ as she has received them," receiving those only to the Holy Communion who are "confirmed or ready and desirous to be confirmed." Those, then, admitted into Communion with Bp. Alexander, "must" (to use his words) "come, not as a body, but as individuals; not asserting an independent collective existence, but desiring to be adopted and incorporated into the Church. Their previous baptism he must ascertain to be sufficient; their present doctrines to be, not of this or that form, but in themselves the doctrines of the Church. He must then upon their desire confirm them, as by Canon 60 he is bound to do; and having, by these several acts of the Church wherein he is Bishop, separated and taken them out from their former fellowship, he may admit them to the blessed Eucharist; and in that privilege retain them as long as by doctrines, morals, and liturgical conformity, they remain stedfast in their profession." p. 28, 9. The consecration then of Bp. Alexander is not even a step toward that which the Prussian Government holds out, "a developement" under *our* Bishop, "of the German Evangelical Church, according to *its* confession, and with the use of its Liturgy. It is purely an act for our own Church, and does not in any way connect her with, or commit her to, Lutheranism.

God's ancient people than in any other branch,) there is an immediate office, in gathering them into the One fold, and in ministering to that other people[o], who, amid the other manifold workings of His Providence, were directed by Him to call upon us to convert them; and while, as I trust, we obtain a blessing through our labours, we shall be gathered, together with the representatives of the other branches, ready, in His good time,—there, where He was crucified for us,—to sorrow together that we have rent His seamless coat, and pray Him to fulfil His own prayer for us, that we may be one, as He with the Father is One. These, my Lord, are objects, which will win the hearts of our whole Church; in these longings we shall be all one; these will have, we trust, no perils; and the memory of such a beginning, separate from things perilous to our Church, will, when God shall be pleased to ripen it, consecrate in the heart of all, the recollection of your Grace's Episcopate.

IV. To sum up, my Lord; what we long for, not for our own sakes but for that of the Church whom we wish to serve, is, at the least, peace; if it may be, sympathy, and direction. We wish the Church to

[o] The Druzes; originally a branch of the Mohammedans, whose characteristic it is to look forward to the coming of one of the Caliphs whom they believe to have been God Incarnate; a feeling which, when He is "declared to them Whom they ignorantly" look for, might become an earnest longing for Him Who is to come. Their application for some one to teach them the Christian faith, was not to Prussia but to us.

act, not ourselves ; we wish a direction to be given to this mighty movement within our Church, which, swelling as it is, month by month, and day by day, cannot be checked, cannot be overlooked, but may be guided,—not, in the default of others, to be ourselves the persons who are to guide it. We wish to see the Church take it up into itself, not to let it roll on, unrecognised, unguided, and with the risk occasionally of bursting its banks, because pent up too narrowly, and opposed by those who have no office to oppose it, so vehemently. We wish to have the direction of things taken out of our own hands into theirs to whom, in the order of God's Providence, it belongs to direct and guide His Church. Had this been done some years past, much of our present disorders might probably have been avoided. We understand that it is said by some, that the writers of the " Tracts" did good service up to a certain time, but that since they have gone too far. Would we had been recognised then! would that it had been avowed that our teaching was, in its main outlines, the teaching of the Church; so could we never, (as we have against our own will,) been made to have the appearance of a party, or been made to stand out thus prominently from our Church in whose name we taught, or received a sectarian name, in itself a blot upon the Church, in that the name of that writer was given who was led first to vindicate at length the doctrine of our Church and the Creed, then most

disputed—Baptismal Regeneration. But they who should have guided, for whatever cause, stood aloof; they looked on, mostly, and let others speak, when they themselves should have been listened to and have overruled; they allowed us to be entitled "heretics" for vindicating an article of the Creed, and left it undetermined whether we or they who opposed our teaching, spake the mind of the Church: the Church did not speak, and things, in the chaos of conflicting opinions, rolled onwards; the very conflict required new ground to be taken up; what might have been best reserved, until persons were riper for it, was forced upon us then: it was not the equable advance of the Church, as one mighty army, returning from its captivity under the elements of this world to take possession of its almost forgotten inheritance, it was rather the desultory warfare of individuals, each seizing and maintaining a post, as he saw occasion, inviting who would to follow him, moving some in one direction, some in another, some faster some slower, so that the whole motion, though on the whole with one tendency, and overruled invisibly, we trust, by the One "Captain of the Lord's hosts," has been irregular, disjointed, distracted.

Yet even now, it is not too late, if the same course towards those who have been prominent in this restoration, be not persevered in. My Lord, with respect I may say, it is too late for any mere check. It is not by any warning as to any of our

supposed tendencies, or by cautions as to any particular statement, or by silencing any one or more of us, that things can be stayed. When the whole ocean is stirred from its depths, to what end to stay, if we could, a single wave? One, and the chief among us, has, at a critical moment for our Church, been silenced as to that controversy which most endangers it, and in which his writings rendered the most signal service; it was not meant doubtless, but on a sensitive mind it was the natural effect. Have the events of the last ten months given reason to think that we have gained thereby? have things been more as your Lordships wish, because the master-mind was withdrawn? or do the Charges of the last summer seem to have promoted peace? does all which has been going on of late,—in which occasion has been taken of an University Election to vent what was pent up, and strife was but let out, not generated by it,—desecrating and distracting holy seasons and the very Festival of "peace to men of peace" with strife and debate,—does this give hope that we are in the way to cherish mutual love, and gain peace?

This very system, which has now been begun, of procuring lay-addresses from persons who mostly know nothing of the teaching against which they petition, wherein did it originate? The excitement of last spring was gradually subsiding; a great sacrifice had been made to the peace of the Church; he who had originated and they who had cooperated

in our "Tracts" had willingly seen them brought to a disgraced close; and we hoped that the Church might accept the offering, and calmly weigh what had been brought forward. Instead of this, the excitement has been ten-fold. The Bishops' Charges have been made the occasion of attacks, too often, alas! from the pulpit, and that in language little fitted for the sanctuary of God, where our Lord is "in the midst" of us. Persons who hate the principles of the Church for their strictness, or for subjecting the individual will, who, with the condemnation of what they hate, mix up ribaldry and profaneness, have still been glad to carry on their unholy warfare under the banner of our Bishops. Those severed from the Church and wishing her destruction, still plead the authority of our Bishops. Thoughtful sermons on sacred things have been noted down and blasphemously commented upon and ridiculed. It is inconceivable what a flood of profaneness has been, in the last few months, poured out upon our unhappy land under the plea of speaking against what such persons have ventured to call "heresy." And all this, through (one must say) blasphemous writing in the worst part of the periodical press, has reached every corner of our land; they who cannot read, hear; they who understand not what they read, still partake of the general agitation; the repose of our once peaceful villages is broken in upon; the most stable part of our population unsettled; the less thoughtful seem to

look forwards to some evil which is to come upon them unawares; "we are all," it seems, (to use their own language,) "to become Papists;" and so they are prepared to desert our Church when occasion offers; others are taught to mistrust the Ministers who have been labouring faithfully among them for years: if former negligences are any where repaired, the negligent have the popular cry ready for their plea; the serious and earnest-minded stand aghast, looking in sorrowful perplexity, what all this can mean. Until of late, men of more thoughtful minds were the more stirred to enter into holy Orders, because our gracious Master Himself seemed to be "hiring labourers into His Vineyard," and "giving each his work;" now, some such even shrink back, doubting, and in dismay what our Bishops may do. What wonder, if some are faint-hearted whether our Lord be in the vessel, which is not only so tempest-tost, but whose very shipmen and pilots are so disunited, how or whither to guide her, "neither sun nor stars appearing?"

If this course then avail not, it is time to try some other. I ventured to say, my Lord, that it is too late to try any mere check. It has been a remarkable phænomenon in this crisis of our Church, that the laity, whom checks of this sort would not reach, and for whom they would not be intended, have on the whole embraced these views more uncompromisingly than the Clergy.

One might apply (mostly to the letter) the words of Tertullian[y], "Men cry out that the state is beset, that the Christians are in their fields, in their forts, in their islands. They mourn, as for a loss, that every sex, age, condition, and now even rank, is going over to this"—(so was Christianity itself called)—"sect." Would that, as to too many, his other words did not hold, "And yet they do not by this very means advance their minds to the idea of some good therein hidden: they allow not themselves to conjecture more rightly, they choose not to examine more closely. Here alone is the curiosity of man dull; they love to be ignorant, where others rejoice to know." Yet the very circumstances in the Church which give encouragement, cause anxiety proportionate. From the very first, these views spread with a rapidity which startled us[z]. We then dreaded lest what spread so rapidly should not root deeply. Even at the first, the light seemed to spread like watchfires from mountain-top to top, each who received it conveying it on to another, so that they who struck the first faint spark, knew not how or to whom it was borne onward. The sacred torch passed from hand to hand; their own neither carried nor could withhold it. And now the light has been reflected from hill-top to valley, has pene-

[y] Apol. c. 1.

[z] "There seems to be something judicial in the rapid spread of these opinions." Bp. D. Wilson, Sermon, p. 63.

trated into recesses; abroad, at home, within, without, in palace or cottage; has passed from continent to continent; we see it spread daily, until the whole heaven be kindled; every where opposed, yet finding the more entrance. The indirect influences, as is always the case in all great movements, has been far greater than the direct. It re-appears, here or there, one knows not how. One may say reverently, firmly believing Whose work it is, "It bloweth where It listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence It cometh, or whither It goeth."

But since this is so, there is the more anxiety as to individual cases, lest persons use wrongly what they have so frequently acquired for themselves without any previous discipline or moral training. We need additional guidance every where, not to risk the withdrawal of any which we have. Our Laity look to be guided by the Clergy, our Clergy by their Bishops, the young by the elder; but if, instead of guidance, our Clergy are but silenced by general admonitions, or warned away from this or that point, or receive but admonitions which sound like condemnation, but which they know not to be founded on any thorough understanding of the views which are condemned, things can but become worse. Our greatest fear is lest, whereas each class might by due method be retained in its own sphere, each being insulated and deprived of its due direction, the whole should become yet more dis-

organized. There are wants extensively felt which may be satisfied if but ordinances be restored, already provided by the Church, but that unhappily they are fallen into desuetude. There is greater longing for devotion; let our daily prayers, instead of being left to be almost the badge of a section of our Church[z], be countenanced; let the keeping of fasts and festivals, the weekly commemoration of the Passion of our Lord, and the hallowing of Lent, and the cheerful joy of the Pentecostal season, the greater frequency of Communions, the restoration of the Offertory, and its use in the collection of alms for religious ends, be encouraged. There is a greater longing for discipline, for acting under rule, for the comforts of absolution under a burthened conscience; let the "Ministers of God's Word" be encouraged to train themselves to receive those "griefs" when others wish to "open" them, and give them "the benefit of absolution;" and since the godly discipline which our Church yearly laments, cannot yet be restored, at least let it be extended where it can and is desired; let not persons have the temptation (I know such cases) of seeking relief for their consciences in the Roman Communion, because they look for discouragement if they apply to Ministers

[z] Persons have been dissuaded from reviving them on this ground. A party-newspaper lately warned against the Wednesday and Friday Service. (Brit. Crit. No. 61, p. 229.) The restoration has even involved severe privation and suffering.

in our own. There are longings for a life more removed from the world and spent in acts of devotion and charity, there is every where much undirected energy which would fain be taught how to do good, but which now wastes itself too often or even does harm, because left to itself; let this be organized;—in a word, let our Church—instead of leaving every one to "do what is right in his own eyes," and herself occupying an easy medium, rather reproving or forbidding those who are too eager than kindling those who are remiss—seek to provide for the manifold wants of her children; be in life what she is in theory and in her Prayer-book; care for lower tempers, yet not neglect the higher; find vents for the various longings which God has infused; guide, not simply repress; train, what, though unformed and undisciplined, is still reality and life; and we shall be a holier, happier, more united Church; less at strife without, because severally more at peace within; less disputatious, because more reverent; understand one another better, because loving more; less suspicious of others, as more suspecting ourselves; less engaged in things which concern us not, because more occupied in what concerns us, our duties, reverence, love, and fear of Almighty God.

Then, my Lord, shall any of us take the station which we had rather have, building up, according to our several offices and talents, our Lord's household, not forced out of our peculiar posts to guide

men's minds, because they come to any of us, not finding guidance elsewhere. Let the Catholic teaching of our Church, and her holy practices be put forward, and we shall no longer stand out conspicuous, because we teach or recommend them. Let the unquestionable teaching of our Church, as to her Orders, the Sacraments, the value of good deeds, and Judgment to come according to our works, repentance towards God as well as Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, fasting, self-discipline, alms, prayer, reverence,—I might say, the contemplation of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, as the End of our life and death, aims, longings, faith, hope, and love,—be inculcated, and a temper of mind will, I trust, be formed, wherein we shall have a holy calm, and may, in peace and godly fear, consider what remains, and, through the Blessed Spirit of peace, understand it and each other.

In the mean time, your Grace will earnestly desire to promote peace. We much need it; while this tumult lasts, people cannot consider any thing calmly; excitement is not the state in which to come to any settled result; these vague suspicions, ready to believe all evil, are no element of that charity which "thinketh none." These idle fears, as if persons, because they recognise what is valuable in another Church, must therefore be ready to abandon that wherein God has placed them, are but so many tares sown by the Enemy to hinder the growth of the good seed. It is but

another instance, how people, acting on different principles, must needs at first, (unless they be mutually patient,) misunderstand one another. To those who honour their Church on no other ground than its conformity to their own ideal of excellence, or her superiority to all other branches of the Church, every confession of imperfection would tend to shake their confidence; they understand not the position of those who, feeling that they owe their allegiance to their Church, because she has the Apostolical succession in this land, and God has placed them in her, and in her made them members of His Son, reverence her, as such, and dare not think of forsaking her, so long as they see no proof that she is forsaken of their and her Saviour, "the Saviour of the Body." These may safely take the tone of humility, so that they feel that in confessing the sins of their fathers, they are confessing their own also. A mother is not loved the less, because she has suffered at the hands of strangers[a]. In like way, with regard to

[a] The following thoughtful passage of one of a different school, has been shewn me while writing the above; the writer makes a stronger confession than has perhaps been made lately, yet was not therefore accused of disaffection. "*The Church of England, in its present state, is not fitted for a General Church.* Its secularity must be purged away. We shall hasten that day when Christians shall be of one heart and one mind, if we inculcate the spirit of charity on our respective circles. I have aimed much at this point, and shall push it farther. The rest must be left to Providence. He only can, by unknown means, heal the schisms of the Church, and unite it together as one

our reformation itself. They who can justifytheir adherence to their Church, only by her inerrancy, and who would be ready to forsake her, if they thought she had done some things amiss, setting up forthwith some sect of their own (as persons continually have done, carrying out their principles[h])—these must needs think any one disaffected to our Church, who admits any blame to have attached to her. Their own affections are not to her, for herself, but as exhibiting their ideal of a Church; if they thought otherwise, they would leave her. And so, supposing others ready to act upon their principles, they cannot understand persons confessing with holy Daniel "for our sins and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and Thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us," and yet that they "yearned over her stones and it pitied them to see her in the dust," or with our own Herbert,

> The second Temple could not reach the first;
> And the late Reformation never durst
> Compare with ancient times and purer years,
> But, in the Jews and us, deserveth tears.

and yet live thankfully under it, and in the dim estate of these last times look the more for the Coming of the Lord to His Temple.

external body; and that this will be done, as some think, by persecution, appears highly probable. I see no other means adequate to the end." Cecil's Remains, p. 353.

[h] As, the Plymouth brethren and others recently.

I may say this the rather, my Lord, because, (while every one must acknowledge that there was miserable sin connected with our Reformation,) I myself hope better of the Reformers than some have lately expressed themselves, and readily receive their declaration that they meant to teach what the Church taught, even while they fell into the language of the Zuinglian school[c]. But it is plainly unjust to accuse those who hold otherwise, of disaffection to our Church, since our Church was not the creature of the Reformation, was "not of man nor by man," but is the same city of God, set up for man's salvation, which was originally planted on these shores by Apostles or Apostolic men. Our attachment is to her, not *because of* any changes which she has undergone, though thankful for His Providence and guidance of her, but *amidst* them, as the precious gift of God, the Ark, which however tossed up and down, He has still guided; "a City which hath foundations, whose Builder and Maker" He is; and we are persuaded that, as heretofore, so now, "the rain, and floods, and winds," however permitted to "beat upon" our "house," and even, for the time, to seem to shake it, will but shew the more that her foundations rest upon "the Rock, that is, Christ." Our attachment is to her, such as God by His Providence has formed her or allowed her to become, and to Him we hopefully entrust her and

[c] Especially, Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner.

ourselves in her, not forestalling what He may design with her, nor limiting His wisdom, that she should ever remain as the Reformation left her, nor yet imagining how He may, if so He will, further restore or enlarge her; much less, ourselves seeking in any way to change her outward form; rather praying with good Bp. Andrews that "what is lacking in her may be supplied," and trustful that He Who has guarded her so long, will still keep her from all heresy and schismatic acts, nor allow her confession of the true Faith to be obscured.

If, as we trust, this be granted, there will, I may venture to assure your Lordship, as far as the observation of individuals can extend, be no extensive defection from our Church. It is very remarkable, already, how persons have by conscience or supernatural Providence, been stayed when, humanly speaking, there seemed nothing to withhold them; it is marvellous, in how many ways God has retained persons within our Communion, when they seemed all but lost to her, and has thereby the more shewn that He is present amid what is now going on within her. And, year by year, as the principles of our Church are more restored and acted upon, the life-giving juice will circulate more through this our "choice Vine" and will retain the grapes, which now seem too ready to drop off, or be "plucked[d]" by every

[d] Ps. lxxx.

passer-by; our "broken hedge" will again be restored; our vineyard no more "trodden down" nor "laid waste[e]." It has been the sickly state of our vine, which has parted with its grapes so readily. As holiness is restored, so will the healthy action, which will not cast them off, but ripen them for Him, Who looketh for its fruits. Meanwhile we may have to mourn over the loss of individuals to Romanism, and the more, if unhappily these miserable divisions and hard speeches of one Minister against another be allowed to continue; but let us learn to take them sorrowfully and in patience, as God's chastisements, not in wrath against one another; displeased with ourselves and our actual state and our manifold defects, which bring upon us these tokens of God's displeasure, not wasting ourselves in unchastened disputings, with whom the fault most lies. They are a sore trial to families; they are probably felt most sorely, and most efforts made to prevent them, by those upon whom the unthinking world casts the blame; but it is too probably part of the trial, "the fire and water" through which our afflicted Church is to "pass," before it be "brought out into a wealthy place." Suffering is the very condition of all restoration. The period of restoration, in body or mind or spirit, in individuals or states or Churches, is always the

[e] Is. v.

most critical. The struggle is the sharpest, and the peril and suffering the greatest, when the evil Power is about to yield to the Divine command, and quit the body it has possessed. The evil "spirit cried and rent him sore and came out of him; and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, he is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose[f]." If we then are sore rent, so that to some it seems as if our Church must be rent asunder, we may be cheered by our very sufferings, and hope the more that Satan "hath" the greater "wrath" with us, "because he knoweth that he hath but a short time;" we may the more hope that He is about to "take" us "by the hand, lift" us "up, and" we shall "arise." Our Church has been in part un-Catholicized by those who helped in a degree to unsecularize her. As then her former partial restoration was not obtained without the loss of very many of her members and even her Ministers to Dissent, so now it is too likely that some will be lost to Romanism. People can now look back and even calmly contemplate not those losses only, but even Wesleyanism, as an agency permitted by God in the restoration of our Church. And yet it has rent a million of members from our Church in this country; it is carrying division, wherever the English name is spread, and is degenerating into

[f] Mark ix. 26, 27.

developed heresy; even now, though at length giving back very many, it still carries off others, just as, passing from carelessness to more earnest lives, they were in the way to become valuable members of the Church. We can now see that, (amid whatever defects,) religious earnestness has grown, and are thankful for the life vouchsafed to us, though the rent made has been the deepest and sorest since that consequent upon the Reformation. Let those then, who do see that our Church has been, on the whole, gaining, not be disquieted or start back, at these occasional sad losses; rather have we great reason to bless Almighty God, that as yet they have been so few. These mutual suspicions and heart-burnings among ourselves are doing far more harm to our Church, than any losses, however sore. Rather, the losses, which we all feel in common, let us mourn in common before our God; act upon the spirit of the ancient rule, which, before the holy season now approaching, provided for the laying aside all disputes; humble ourselves in common; and these very losses will, by the increase of our humility, turn to our gain: sorely as they wound us, they will be but His health-giving Hand in merciful severity, "purging us, that we may bring forth more fruit."

We need but peace and love, and we shall soon understand each other better than some now think possible; and with renewed union, we should obtain new strength for the mighty purposes,

which the good Providence of our God seems to destine for our Church. "Were we at one," it has been felt, "we might do any thing." We do not need fresh limitations of articles, one way or the other; we, whom our common Mother has borne hitherto, may well bear with one another; our Church wants no changes from without; her one need is a holy peace within; mutual toleration, forbearance, "charity," such as she has, at this season, been setting forth to us, "not self-seeking, not easily-provoked, thinking no evil, rejoicing not in iniquity," (as so many now seem,) "but rejoicing in the truth, bearing all things, believing all things, hoping all things, enduring all things." Prayers for unity and peace, with mutual self-restraint and forbearance, will avail more to the healing of our disorders and to the composing of disturbed minds, than any of those measures, which persons, ill-informed as to the truth of things, are now so eager to promote.

Much, very much, depends upon your Lordships. I cannot think that our Church, which has so often been marvellously preserved, will now be abandoned. The Hand of God is so manifestly with her, that I have no misgivings as to the ultimate issue; but though it were too shocking to imagine that her Candlestick should be removed and she cast away, and though her gracious Lord is giving earnests to the contrary, still there may be much present distress and suffering which might be hin-

dered; or we may fall short of the fulness of that blessing which His mercy is holding out to us. The very Presence of that Hand ought to make us the more reverently anxious, how we act in every detail, as it bears more or less upon His work, (since He does allow men to deface and even mar it); we ought to act with the more awe and trembling fear and cautious dread, as being the more vividly in His Presence and "working together with Him." In such spirit would we wish, in patience and mistrust of ourselves, to school ourselves to work; and if (with the respect due to your Grace's brethren as our spiritual Fathers) I may so speak, in proportion to the very greatness of your Office, is the depth of anxiety with which you will doubtless put your hands to a work so holy and of such awful magnitude. The eyes of the whole Church are upon what is going on in ours; East and West are being reunited in sympathy to see what God is doing with us; they who had thought us abandoned to heresy, are beginning to recognise in us the signs of a Church, or have even anticipated that we should become more Catholic than themselves[f]; each day brings its own change with it, leaves some fresh impression, moulds some fresh mind, carries some new convictions, or deepens what was impressed before, brings home somewhere some fresh truth. This late or present storm, so far

[f] This was recently said, (and in a good sense,) in a French sermon.

from uprooting any thing, has but made what it assailed, strike its roots deeper, and shewn thereby the more by Whom that was "planted," which could not be "rooted up." "We live," it has been said, "in years the life of centuries." I said, "we have the eyes of the whole Church upon us;" we have tokens that we have far more; in the vehemence of the passions roused, the shocking blasphemies with which holy truths are by ungodly men rent and trampled under foot, nay, in our own sad discords and misunderstandings, we may see that there is one "evil eye" upon us for evil; our Church seems to be the very battle-field of evil spirits: in the manifold restorations of our Church, the renewed life infused simultaneously into every branch of her at once, the Catholicity of extent opened for her in all lands, (such as even the Greek Church never had,) contemporaneously with the Catholicity of spirit re-awakened in her; the continued restoration of the children lost in her captivity and widowhood, and (contrary to the acknowledged history of mere sects, which gradually shrink up and decay) her fruitfulness reserved for her age[5]; the increase of her energy and devotedness in proportion to the magnitude of the evils with which in this nation she is surrounded, and with which she has to grapple,—we may see joyfully and thankfully, that there is One compassionate

[5] Ps. xcii. 14. "They shall bring forth more fruit in old age."

Eye upon our Church for good. In her, that now seems to have its fulfilment[h], "the waters increased, and bore up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth. And the waters prevailed and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters." The swelling of the waters against her seem, we trust, but to raise her the more above the earth and lift her nearer to heaven and her Lord.

At this anxious crisis of our Church, wherein we "are a spectacle to the world and to Angels and to men," have your Lordships been called to your holy station, in the "government of the Church of Christ," where your every word and action is fraught with consequences incalculable; I dare not apprehend that you will not act with the due reverence and caution, when you know how deeply intertwined with the whole frame of our present Church these chords are, upon which you have from time to time touched, and which some, who know not what they are doing, would urge you to pull so vehemently; how many in silence, yet how profoundly, sympathise; how fearfully any mistaken movement might jar through the whole system; what tokens there are that, whoever may have been here or there employed, the whole is the work not of man but of God. I have no fears, but that, as was prayed for you[i], you will "use the authority given to you,

[h] Gen. vii. 17.

[i] Office for the Consecration of Bishops.

not to destruction, but to salvation; not to hurt but to help; giving, as faithful and wise servants, to the family of God their portion in due season, that you may be at last received into everlasting joy." And for this cause I have ventured thus to speak. On your Lordships, singly in your measure, but much more, were you to act collectively, may depend the well-being of our Church, or the degree of her well-being, during her whole existence.

It is with intense anxiety, in this momentous day, that any one must act who is placed where his actions must have influence; with such anxiety must one watch every act of others, or take each step one's self; with such must I now commit these words, to be heard of men, wishing to weigh all, yet fearful lest with some they leave the impression the very opposite of what I would—how much greater must be your anxiety, on whose high and holy office, in God's Providence, such a weight and load of responsibility now, suddenly, beyond all past times, devolves!

Yet "even hereunto were we called," and "the greater the sufferings, the greater also the consolation." One may look back, with almost faintness of heart, to those more quiet times when the peaceful establishment of the Church in this country, her Cathedrals and Parish Churches, the palaces of her Bishops, the happy homes of her Clergy, to many eyes made her wilderness look like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the

Lord. But those who had their lot in this fair ground and goodly heritage, may well have had misgivings when in the course of the daily services they have read of the labours, the weariness, and painfulness, and daily care of all the Churches, which pressed upon St. Paul; and yet more still when they have dwelt on the account of the Sufferings of which even these are but a faint image, by which the great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls was consecrated to His Everlasting Priesthood. And now that those times are passed away, and it seems likely to be His will that the remainder of our lives should be passed, if not in suffering, yet in manifold and oppressive anxiety, each day bringing its own burden, though with it its own consolation, I trust that "the burden and heat of the day" will be gladlier to us,—if so be we may hope that we are working faithfully in our Lord's Vineyard,—than ever was the freshness and cool of the morning, when we too were yet unworn.

We would not willingly aggravate the heavier portion, which our "fathers in God" will have to bear; nor will they, I trust, (if one may so speak of those "set over us in the Lord,") be surprised at these trials "as though some strange thing had happened to" us, nor think hardly of ourselves as though we had caused them; but rather receive them as a part of that most precious bequest of our Lord to His Church, "the fellowship of His sufferings," and find their consolation, in that their

Office, ever Apostolic in its origin and descent and character and commission, is now again beginning to receive from the Chief Bishop the especial impress of His Cross, the likeness of Apostolic "wearisome and painfulness." The solemn words of one of the best and greatest minds[k] our Church has nurtured, and who lived in the beginning of one of her most troubled periods, will, I trust, minister consolation, as well as find an echo, in the hearts of those, who, with your Grace, have been called of God, to "feed the flock of God, which He purchased with His own Blood."

"It seemeth, the Consecration of legal High Priests, so long as they accurately observed the rites and manner prescribed by Moses, did one way or other cost them so dear, that no man which duly weighed the charge laid upon them would be very ambitious of the office. Hence saith our Apostle, 'No man taketh this honour unto himself but he that is called of God as Aaron was[l]:' so likewise Christ took not to Himself this honour to be made an High Priest, but He that said unto Him 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee,' put this charge or honour upon Him; against His will questionless, as man, albeit He most obediently submitted Himself to His Father's will, because He had taken the form of a servant upon Him. His Consecration, we may safely avouch, cost Him

[k] Jackson, on the Creed, b. 9. sect. 1, fin.

[l] Heb. v. 4.

dearer than the Consecration of all legal Priests that had been before Him, or of all the Christian Bishops or Prelates which have lived since did or doth them, whether severally or jointly. Never did any man utter those words so truly and sincerely, 'Episcopari nolo,' as He did, or pray so earnestly, that the charge of His Consecration might be mitigated whilst He was in His Agony. But how dear soever His Consecration cost Him, the costs and charges of it, though altogether unknown to us, were recompensed by the purchase which He gained by it: for, as it followeth, 'being thus Consecrated, He became the Author of everlasting salvation to all that obey Him;' and their salvation was and is as pleasant to Him as His sufferings whereby He was Consecrated were for the present distasteful."

May I, however unworthy, be permitted to pray that these things which for the present are distasteful and "grievous," being hallowed by His precious Sufferings, may turn to your endless "profit" and joy.

Your Grace's humble and faithful
servant and son,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church,
Quinquagesima, 1842.

O Lord, who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth; send thy Holy

Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before Thee: Grant this for Thine only Son Jesus Christ's sake. Amen. [m]

[m] Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday.

NOTES.

Note A, *page* 58.

Extract from the Bishop of Chester's Charge, attributing the teaching of the "Tracts" to the agency of Satan. (p. 19—22.)

"And here it is impossible not to remark upon the subtle wiles of that Adversary, against whom the Church of Christ is set up, and whose power it is destined to overthrow. His activity is in exact proportion to the activity which is used against him. His vigilance never fails to seize the opportunities which the weakness of man too frequently supplies. No sooner is good seed sown in the field, than tares are found springing up amidst the wheat. Such has been the case throughout the whole history of the Church: and it has been signally and unexpectedly exemplified in the present day, by the favour shewn to notions which might seem inconsistent with the advancement of reason, by the revival of errors, which might have been supposed to be buried for ever."

"To enter upon this subject generally or fully, would be quite incompatible with the limits of a Charge, and to treat it cursorily would not be respectful to my brethren. I shall confine myself to a brief review of two points, in which the interests committed to us are especially concerned."

" The principle by which, in all ages and countries, the power of Satan has been most successfully assailed, and the human heart most strongly actuated, is that of simple reliance on Christ Jesus: simple acceptance of the truth, that He is ' made unto us of God, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.' Accordingly, this doctrine, that, lying under God's wrath and condemnation, we are justified by faith in Jesus Christ: this plain and simple truth has uniformly been assailed by every instrument which the enemy could bring to bear against it. From the time when certain men went down from Jerusalem and troubled the Church at Antioch; from the time when Paul had to grieve over the disciples in Galatia, that they were ' removed from the grace of Christ into another gospel, which was not another gospel;' for it was no gospel at all; from the earliest days until now, this has been the point of attack, because on this all depends. We are still experiencing the same and from the same cause."

" Through the merciful providence of God, the true principles of the Gospel were prevailing through the length and breadth of the land, and effects were following which they alone are capable of producing. Meanwhile the enemy is on the watch; knows well where his danger lies; and contrives to cast reproach upon the doctrine which is the hinge of Christian truth and Christian practice; to confound things which ought to be kept distinct; things inherent in man with things extraneous to man; individual duties with vicarious merits; and so to reduce religion to that doubt and uncertainty which never has led, and never will lead, to a consistent course of action."

" It is notorious that this attempt, frequently made, and too often successful, has been renewed in the present day. The Author of our salvation, ' not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance and the knowledge of the truth,' has commanded that the Gospel

should be preached to every creature. Those have now risen up who affirm that the doctrine of the Gospel, the propitiation made for sin, is a doctrine too dangerous to be openly disclosed, too mysterious to be generally exhibited; and would thus deprive the sinner at once of his motive to repent, and his comfort in repenting. It has been another part of the same system to involve the article of our justification in obscurity; what has been done for us, and what is to be wrought in us, are confused together; and, practically, man is induced to look to himself, and not to his Redeemer, for acceptance with God."

Yet the Bishop, who could write so painfully, and who, in other passages of his Charge, *seemed* to deny doctrines of our Church and of the Church Catholic, did himself, in the last year, I am informed, deliver an address to those whom he was about to confirm, the whole tone of which was altogether Catholic. It came as a great relief to some of his Clergy, who had been much distressed by his Charge; and furnishes another remarkable instance of what every one conversant with those of an opposite school continually sees—how much of the apparent condemnation of each other arises in misapprehension of what is actually held by either.

Note B, *page* 127.

Extract from a German Periodical, illustrative of the view taken by the sounder part of the German writers of the introduction of Episcopacy from England.

The following extract is taken from a full article in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," a periodical representing the views of a large section of the German theologians, of varying shades of doctrine, (as will appear

from the very names of the editors*,) but, on the whole, those of the middle party of such as are engaged in the work of restoration, with no strong feeling for Lutheranism. The article appeared in October last; it contains no allusion to any domestic plans for the introduction of Episcopacy, but is written with reference to the influence of the opinions now prevailing amongst us, as they bear upon themselves. This object is thus stated by the writer in the opening of the article:

"What is now going on in the English Church is of such sort, as not only to have roused from their repose (so far as they enjoyed it) her own members, and compelled them to decide and take their side for or against, but to claim the attention of those without her, and make them wish thoroughly to understand it. And this is not mere curiosity, as though they who follow those events with eager expectation, were like spectators in a play or a race; in more than one respect, are we concerned ourselves. First, amid whatever manifest differences, there still are not wanting points of contact and analogies between the state of things in both countries. Then also, in England, they have the German-Protestant Church in view, pass judgments upon her, form wishes relatively to us, and would fain point us out our way, and bestow on us what is to promote our well-being. Since then our concerns too are discussed, we may as well assist at the conference."

The writer then explains how the title Anglo-Catholicity designates the movement going on here; and his observations may be serviceable, when people are questioning whether our principles and those of the foreign bodies are the same.

"They wish to claim for the English Church the

* Drs. Umbreit, Ullman, in union with Drs. Gieseler, Lücke, Nitzsch.

character of Catholicity. The Apostles' Creed contains the article, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam; in the Lutheran translation [?] it stands 'a holy Christian Church;' the English translation has kept more faithfully to the original, and in the Common Prayer-book it is, 'the Holy Catholic Church.' This minutia, that this little word 'Catholic' has remained in the Creed, has its weight. Since the Apostles' Creed is recited in each public service in the English Church [b], and repeated by the people after the Minister, not only is the word 'Catholic' retained in a good sense, but there is also maintained a vivid feeling and consciousness of a pervading Unity of this Christian Church, to which they belong. Herewith is an element provided, which, under favourable circumstances, might become a fruitful germ of views, relatively new and amazing, of comprehensive compass, and, in their practical tendency, of no ordinary weight. If, in addition, we take into account, that the English Church, however great store she sets by her quality of a Catholic Church, is yet also essentially a reformed Church, and stands opposed to the Roman-Catholic Church, we come nearer to the specific meaning of Anglo-Catholicity."

The conclusion, above referred to, has immediate reference to a hint in Mr. Biber's "Standard of Catholicity," of the duty incumbent upon these bodies to seek to recover what they had abandoned. However one may lament that the writer considers Episcopacy as something merely outward, yet there is much truth both in what he says of their own condition, and his gentle irony at our insular self-complacency.

"So are our ecclesiastical relations viewed by those of the High Church [the English Church], so are they accounted for; and so do they think that the evil [Rationalism] is to be cured. They hold it the duty and calling of

[b] It would seem then, not always in the Lutheran.

their orthodox Church, to undertake the care of the sister branches of the Universal Church, especially when these are in danger of sinking continually deeper in darkness and error. Their notion, in one word, is, that if we would introduce the Episcopal form of Government, and that in such wise, as to have Bishops consecrated by English Bishops, the spiritual authority would be based on its true and safe foundation, and thus would all unbelief and un-Churchism be most effectually suppressed. It is implied, of course, that where now no ordination at all is used, ordination of all Clergy by the Bishops is to be introduced."

"Now then certainly there is an appearance, as though there were not wanting a disposition on our side, to meet half-way the reform-schemes of the High-Church islanders. On the one hand, the institution of Evangelical Bishops does exist in some German states, and, theoretically also, there are some friends of this form of Church-Government, as when Stahl in his recent work on Ecclesiastical Law gives to the Episcopal Government the preference over that by Consistories and Presbyteries. On the other hand, where Ordination is not employed at all, much, on many sides, is said about introducing it."

"But looking more closely, in neither case does the real state of things answer the views and schemes of the High Church. First as to the Episcopate, the Evangelic Bishops in Germany are a creation of the state, by virtue of the principle that the King is Bishop of the Church of his country[b]. The High Church on the contrary, protests formally and solemnly, 'The King can make no Bishop.' The consecration by the Church, and that through the hand of a Bishop who can rightly claim the Apostolic

[b] They hold the office also only during pleasure. The king who makes them, can unmake them. "Bishop" among them is a mere title of office.

succession,—this, and this alone, makes a Bishop. The same objection, on the Anglican view, would equally hold good against the theoretical commendation of the Episcopal Government, above spoken of, since all therein maintained was, on grounds of expediency, a relative superiority of the Episcopal over the Presbyterian form of government[c]; whereas, on the Anglican view of Episcopacy as a Divine institution, it is an absolute Essential. Still a step has been made towards an approximation; and, in the High Church circles, people flatter themselves with the hope that, sooner or later, we shall betake ourselves to the Church of England, and beg of one of the British Successors and Possessors of the Apostolic office, the Church's blessing for German Protestantism; a blessing, which would serve at the same time as the benediction on the spiritual marriage between the English and German Church. In this way a very promising beginning would be made towards raising the English Church into a sort of Rome, a Mother-Church, with the Primacy over Protestant Christendom. Nay, when the Roman Catholic Churches should renounce their errors, and be converted from Romanism to the true and genuine Catholicism, which the English Church, singly and alone, has preserved; when, lastly, the Greek Catholicism of the slavish East, now again renewing its youth, becomes well-disposed to Anglo-Catholicism, then will the whole Christian world be reconciled with the Church of England, and acknowledge her Primacy; and then, what Irenæus in his time said of Rome, will, in a more excellent, ideal, sense be fulfilled in the English Church. 'Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles,

[c] [Also, as government only, not as a spiritual office, or the channel of spiritual gifts.]

in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ est ab Apostolis, traditio.'"

"The union with the [Roman] Catholic Church is not at present very immediate. The Court has gained the victory; the received opinions in the Catholic world are more Roman than they lately were: and 'an union with Rome, as it is,' say these writers, 'is impossible.' But if we look around us in times past, recollect the Ecclesiastical principles of the Reformation-synods of the 15th century, the Gallican liberties, Justus Febronius and many other maintainers of like views at present, an union of the Catholic Church in this form with the Anglican, does not seem a mere chimera. Did not the Gallican Clergy of the 17th century, stand nearer to an English Bishop than to the Jesuits? witness the thanks of the Gallican Synod of St. Germain's, sent in writing to the English Bishop Bull, for the service which he had rendered the Catholic Church by his defence of the Ante-Nicene fathers against the Jesuit Petavius."

"Until the golden age of the union of our Church with that of England arrives, we remain without Bishops who can claim Apostolical succession; consequently also without real Ordination; for this depends upon a real Episcopacy. In this respect also, the advances on our side are mere appearances. Whoso recommends the introduction of Ordination, where it now exists not, means only to restore a laudable custom, which he expects to work well, not to satisfy an absolute duty, of Divine right. So then we and the Anglo-Catholics are still far enough apart."

"This they may lament. But if they lament for us, I fear they will not have much thanks for it. Who of us could be so minded, as to think that the cure for our religious and Ecclesiastical condition is to be found in the Episcopal Succession and the threefold spiritual con-

secration? No one of any understanding could look to a remedy, coming in every sense[d] so 'from without,' as a solution of our perplexities. If our theological and philosophical, religious and ecclesiastical, confusions cannot be cured from within, homoiopathically, i. e. by remedies corresponding with the disease, then there is no help for us."

[d] i. e. from a foreign Church and as a thing simply external.

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

CHRIST, THE SOURCE AND RULE OF CHRISTIAN LOVE.

A SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE

FEAST OF S. JOHN THE EVANGELIST,

MDCCCXL,

AT ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, BRISTOL,

IN AID OF A NEW CHURCH

TO BE ERECTED

IN AN OUTLYING DISTRICT IN THAT PARISH;

WITH A PREFACE

ON THE RELATION OF OUR EXERTIONS TO OUR NEEDS.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

Published by request.

OXFORD,
JOHN HENRY PARKER;
J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON;
STRONG, BRISTOL; LANE, CLIFTON.
1841.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

PREFACE.

THE following Sermon is published, as it was preached, if it may, in any way, aid in increasing the impulse, of late given to Church-building, and to self-denying charity, as shewn therein. In the exertions which have been made in this necessary work, during the last years, there is much reason, as in the restored Temple after the Captivity, for joy and thankfulness, still more for sorrow and humiliation: joy, that God is bringing back some few wanderers into His fold, out of the captivity of Satan; sorrow, that for each hundred restored, tens of thousands are, through our neglect, still wandering in the pathways of death; joy, in that in these exertions, inadequate and imperfect as they have been, we may see "the good hand of our God upon us" rousing us from our past listlessness, and leading us forward to increased performance of duty, of which we may trust that the present beginnings are but the dim morning-dawn; for sorrow and humiliation, in that, as a nation, we have so little profited either by mercies or by warnings, and have fallen so short of the stirrings of His hand. And unless we humble ourselves, there is little hope that God will raise us up to do deeds more worthy of our Christian Name. Boasting of our new Churches, our deeds and contributions, blinds ourselves, and must be displeasing to Almighty God. New Churches, if we were indeed faithful, would be

an ordinary daily sight, (for it was calculated long ago that to provide for our increasing population alone, omitting the deep debt already contracted, a Church should be built daily,) so ordinary a sight, that it would be rather strange not to see them rising. As it is, the sight should humble us, because it is its rareness which makes each new Church a source of so much gladness. We have been mixing too much self-gratulation with the rightful joy, that something has been done among us for God's glory and the souls of men; all works of duty and mercy have their allotted joy: yet more may it be a joy, if in this renewed anxiety to fulfil on a larger scale forgotten duty, we may venture to recognize the tokens of our Master's Countenance, looking graciously upon this portion of His Church, and by His look, quickening it. Yet such as we have been and are, that Look rather bids us "Repent and do our first deeds," "remember whence we are fallen," than imparts the bright joy of those who have not so fallen; it is a gracious Look, bestowed, we trust, upon us as upon St. Peter, recognizing and restoring us to be an Apostolic Church, as him to be an Apostle; but not until, with him, we have "gone out and wept bitterly." We are apt to speak of the neglect of our immediate forefathers, of the slumber of the last century, of their neglect[a] to provide for the growing population, of their leaving to us their task and burthen to bear as well as our own; and, because we are doing something ourselves, we contrive to hide from ourselves that we are rehearsing the same sad tale of neglect and listlessness

[a] Yet in those times, one Nobleman, of whom the author knows, built four village Churches, one very handsome, and four parsonage houses: has this individual exertion, though now happily re-commencing, been so common among us, that we dare take on ourselves to judge those times?

and indevotion; if they were losing ground, so are we; if they were allowing the wants to accumulate, to be supplied (if at all) by posterity, so are we; if they were but little aware of the extent of the deficiency, and did (as it is alleged) well-nigh nothing, we do but little, though we have not even their excuse; we know, complain, of our wants, yet set ourselves not in earnest to remove them; "spiritual destitution" is become a current phrase, yet while we acknowledge thereby both the misery and duty, we remedy it not: if they threw the duty upon the State, and shielded themselves under its neglect, we acknowledge that the State will not help us, and yet put not our shoulder under the yoke to help ourselves. If they were asleep, we are but like persons in their first waking, unconscious of what is going on around us, whether we are going backwards or forwards, making uncertain unstedfast motions here and there, and thinking and telling people that we are awake, because we have ceased to be fast asleep. We may indeed trust that it will yet be well with us, if this awakening end in our being awakened; yet if we comfort and congratulate ourselves on our present state, it is too like the voice of the sluggard, "A little sleep, a little slumber, a little more folding of the hands to sleep, until poverty come as one that travelleth, and want as an armed man."

The powers of evil are awake, ever on the watch; we see their stirrings, the musterings of their hosts; we feel their approach, their very breath; we speak with terror of Chartism and Socialism; we feel that in the heathen population of our places of manufacture or our mines, there is a moral contagion generated, polluting our atmosphere, choking our breath, and greater than we can know of or conceive: our ills are the greater because we know not what to look for, what form they may assume,

and so also, what form they may not assume; when and how they may not start up upon us; we know that they are withheld by no visible might, but by an Unseen Hand, yet betake not ourselves in earnest to find protection under the shadow of That Hand; we speak currently and familiarly and even well, of an approaching conflict of the kingdoms of Light and darkness, of Christ and Belial, and yet arm not ourselves in earnest for the battle, nor seek to Him Who alone can avert it. We seem like those of old, who were "eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day when Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and swept them all away."

Meanwhile, we are congratulating ourselves, as if all were now right; we hear here and there of plans of ten Churches for some vast town, or fifty for our Metropolis, which is one ninth of our whole people; and, unaccustomed to the like, think that all will now be well; or a fund is raised by instalments for successive years, and the sums so subscribed make a fair show; and in this we rest; the effort is made, and we contemplate it and ourselves in it as though we might account ourselves charitable or safe, and had done not only enough, but a work of supererogation, (so much we seem to admire it,) in having done one deed of Christian charity for the relief of the spiritual starvation of millions; (as though having done a duty once, were a reason for having done with it, instead of persevering in it;) meanwhile, year by year glides by unmarked; the Churches are slowly raised; and long before they are finished, the growing population has far outstripped our lagging steps; the giant growth of our numbers, though silent, stops not; it makes not one effort, like our contributions, and then stands still; it rests not, day nor night; undiminished by foreign war, and as yet by domestic

sedition, unvisited by God's immediate scourges of famine and pestilence, it swells upon us, year by year, a mighty torrent of human souls, gathering fresh strength every where, enlarging every instant, in well-nigh every place, unheard, unheeded, but unceasing and universal, and growing almost visibly under our eyes, if we would but mark it; pent in as yet within the bounds of human law, and stilled by Him, Who "ruleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of his waves, and the madness of the people," but ready to burst forth and overwhelm our land, if ever He should withdraw His merciful "Hitherto shalt thou come and no further;" and while we might fence it in, and conduct it on safely to eternity's endless, boundless, ocean, through the widening channel of the Church, we neglect it. Year by year, we may have some few thousands more inclosed within the Church; yet year by year we have also fresh tens of thousands shut out from her; more Christians, yet far more Heathen also; more light, yet increased darkness. And who then is to guarantee to us that this growing darkness shall not extinguish the light, which we are at so little cost and pains to keep alive? or, if we have still hope in God's past and present mercies to our Church, that our "candlestick" shall not be "removed," nor our "light put out in obscure darkness," where is our pledge that we shall not be left alone, as "an ensign on the top of the mountains, or a beacon on a hill," a monument at once of God's mercy and His wrath, kept alive, like His former people, "for the fathers' sake," yet widowed of all those children, whom God "begat and nourished up" for us, but whom we have failed to keep for Him? It is painful to quote solemn words, lest they prove our condemnation, and we be "bearing witness" and passing sentence against ourselves; yet what is this but attesting that we are the children of the fathers, whom in words we condemn, and in deeds

we imitate, so far from repairing the negligence we condemn in them, that we fail in our duty as they failed in theirs? Why, then, unless we repent and apply ourselves more earnestly to our duties, should it not be said to us, "Truly, ye allow the deeds of your fathers;" "fill ye up then the measure of your fathers, that on you may come"—one shrinks from giving any conclusion to these words, but that they may not fall upon us, and that the blood of those, whom we leave to live and die as Heathen, be not visited upon us, we have much need of more faithful self-denying exertion.

But how old are we, that we should be speaking of the sins and neglect of our forefathers rather than of our own? Are we or they responsible for what took place between 1811 and 1831? or if the generation immediately before us were united with us, are we free? In those twenty years, we, for the most part, were living, acting, hearing what went on around us, and God's word exhorting us by our hopes and our fears, by God's love and His wrath, to have mercy on Christ's poor, nay, we were ourselves praying for the coming of His kingdom and the doing of His will, before we prayed for our daily bread or the forgiveness of our sins; we were praying daily or weekly for His Church, for "our Bishops, Curates, and the congregations committed to their charge:" and yet in these same twenty years, notwithstanding two parliamentary grants, amounting to £1,500,000, while the increase of the population was nearly 4,000,000, the increase of church-room was but 500,000[b]: that is, on the lowest and most inadequate calculation, in those twenty years, there were added to our people two millions and a half of undying souls, for whose salvation no provision whatever was made by a Christian state, or an Apostolic Church; two

[b] Report of Windsor and Eton Church Union Society, 1839, quoted in British Critic, No. 54, p. 468.

millions and a half were added to the sins of our immediate forefathers; mostly, in name as well as in life and in vices, Heathen, and perhaps less miserable, because they were so, but, except as so far as God's love may, by a dispensation secret to us, undo the effects of our want of love, left to perish for ever. These were our deeds; those whom in those twenty years we left to be added to the existing Heathenism, were equal to one fourth of the whole population of England before them. Whatever then we may since have done, or be doing, were it ten-fold what it is, those twenty years,—in which not our fathers only, but we were involved,—saw a phænomenon, the like of which, for its frightfulness, was never seen in any Christian Church since her beginning hitherto, from the day that the Sun of righteousness dawned upon this earth,—that, in the bosom of one Church, there sprung up two millions and a half of Heathen; that, instead of souls being "added to the Church," the scions of the vine which God had planted here were left to grow wild; the offspring of our own bowels, the children of our own Church, were shut out from her who is the image of heaven, and who was the appointed instrument and Ark to conduct us thither. The number of Heathen added to the people in these twenty years was at the lowest estimate, nearly twice as many as souls "added to the Church;" they were equal to one fourth of all who ought to have been, or were gathered into the Church before them; one fourth of all who would have been refreshed under her shadow, had she still retained the full blessing of her God and Maker Who planted her and "filled the land." It is difficult to realize this painful fact, that had all England before been one Church, there has, within twenty years, sprung up a nation within her, alien to her and often hating her and the Gospel and the Light, equal in magnitude to one fourth of what she was, before those twenty years began.

This was what we left undone; and what did we? We, nationally and individually, built, rebuilt, enlarged, repewed, galleried Churches[c], which our fathers built,—and of this far the most in what cost the least, contriving that the ancient structures which our fathers built to God's glory, should, after in a way little seemly or favourable to devotion, hold more worshippers—but in all these ways together, we contrived to provide room for 500,000 additional persons, grown people and children together; i. e. on an average, for 25,000 in each year, and this throughout all the counties of England, and aided, alas! one must rather say, chiefly, by a grant of £1,500,000, which because raised out of the general resources of the nation, we none of us felt individually. Twenty-five Churches containing 1000 each,—had they been so much as this, whereas the room was chiefly gained by cheaply re-adapting what our forefathers had bequeathed to us, but had it even been gained by building new Churches,—twenty-five Churches would have been the offering annually made by this wealthy country, collectively and individually throughout its fifty-two counties; one Church in each two years would have been the quota furnished by each

[c] It was painful to see in former years in the Reports of the Church-building Society, how small a portion of its contributions went to assist in building new Churches; the most was employed in eking out somehow by new pews, or galleries, or otherwise, those already existing. And since in almost every new Church, the first consideration was, how much of the burthen could be shifted off persons' own shoulders upon that Society, it implied how few Churches were then built. The last report of that Society acknowledges the fact, in speaking with thankfulness of a change. "Of the number of grants made during the last year, it is satisfactory to find how large a proportion [nearly half, the whole were 132] is for new Churches and Chapels, amounting together to 58, a number greatly above the average of former years." In 1839 it was but 31; in 1835, but 27.

County for His service, Who makes us this great and wealthy nation. There are even sadder recollections than this penuriousness, how in wealthy towns, because the Parliamentary grant was to be made up by a rate within itself, heart-burnings have been left to this day, and this unhallowed strife about Church-rates had its birth in the very little which was done to provide Church-room for our Christian poor. And this notwithstanding that, one must perhaps rather say, *because*, our money was multiplied by, and in proportion to, our population. We were gorged with wealth; we knew not how to employ it; every wild scheme, which could be devised as a vent for it, and to bring in some earthly return, was eagerly caught at; we knew not what to do with it; it yielded but little interest, because there was so much of it, and so little means of employing it; and the only assured treasure-house, the only safe interest which repays "an hundred-fold," we would not have; we would not lend it to Almighty God, although we had His holy promise, "what he layeth out shall be repaid him again," yea though God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Who deigns to be considered our debtor, promised to repay us Himself, and His payment is Himself.

There should be then, even on this ground, an end, for ever, of the boasting wherewith we compensate ourselves nationally for our individual disclaimers of any merit or intrinsic acceptableness of our good works, as though we might safely take credit to ourselves for the sums which we have raised for circulating the Bible in foreign languages, and converting a few scattered Heathen here and there, while we allowed a large nation of Heathen to spring up among ourselves, unconverted, unnoticed, uncared for, and sent out nations of heathens, in part with the worst vices of the worst of Heathens, to colonize the world.

But sad as those twenty years were, the last ten years, which we may account wholly ours, are probably, in respect of the actual increase of destitution, still sadder; and the denser the Heathen population becomes, the denser must the darkness be, the less penetrated by the light even of the surrounding Christianity, the more inaccessible to it, the more hopeless, the more sinful, blacker in itself and more threatening to us. It is said that "the evil has been fearfully aggravated by the discontinuance of the Parliamentary grant[d]." The disclosure, which the approaching census will lay bare, is too probably one, from which any thoughtful heart must shrink. In the metropolis alone, not merely during the whole period, but during the very years in which the Bishop of London's cheering exertions were made, the destitution became greater than before. Had the forty-one Churches, which are to be completed through the fund hitherto raised, been already finished, and so "147,600 persons been brought within reach of the ministrations of the Church and the pastoral superintendence of her Clergy," "the *actual extent* of spiritual destitution," we are told[e], would be "greater now than it was when the operations of this Fund commenced." And yet this was an effort, which drew the eyes of the whole Church! it was begun and carried on upon a scale larger than any of late years; contributions were, from their scale, more self-denying; God blessed the work, and multiplied "the cruse of oil," although they who were ready to pour it out, not now at a prophet's but at their Lord's bidding, were comparatively few. And if we were losing ground in the very place where the chief exertion was made, during the very years of that exertion, how must the five barren years of the decennium "withered, thin, and

[d] British Critic, ib.

[e] Fourth Report of the Metropolis Churches Fund, p. 10.

blasted by the east wind," in which "the famine was very grievous," have "consumed the land;" how must they have eaten up the five—if for the earnestness' sake of our Bishop and those who aided him, one may dare call them—"good" years! and if this were so here, what must be the history of the whole compass of our unhappy land, town by town, factory after factory.

Nor is this all, which these ten years have to witness against us. We have been relieving ourselves of the pressure of our population by a thoughtless system of colonizing, exporting the members of our Church, as though they had been sheep and oxen for the slaughter, not Christian men. We have in Australia alone laid the foundation of what in the course of a century will probably be four mighty empires or, as we are now acting, republics[f]; but, if our exertions be only such as they have hitherto been, four Heathen states, whether empires or republics, with a weakly Church, keeping by God's mercy a seed of life in her, a light amid the surrounding darkness, yet scarcely such a light, as the Christian Church was in the times

[f] "There is the great Continent of New Holland, upon the shores of which, north, east, south, and west, settlements are daily forming, which in the natural course of events, and through the possession of so many natural advantages, must in the course of a century or less become the seats of so many flourishing kingdoms, or (as our rational policy tends, I fear, rather to make them) republics. There is the great island of Van Diemen's Land, which must form a separate and most important member of the great confederation, growing by accretion, like the coral reefs which surround us: there are the islands of New Zealand recently added to the before inordinate extent of this diocese; and there are the multitude of the islands of the Pacific clustering around, and from their position certain of being, at no remote period, brought into our political vortex; and under *some* form of worship and discipline, to be included among the numbers who profess the Christian faith." Extract of a letter from the Bishop of Australia.

and in the midst of Heathen Rome, unless the Heathen power, which our negligence is fostering, persecute the Church, and she through suffering be purified by those who might have been her children, and by suffering regain some of those whom she might now retain with joy.

And now what is to be the history of the next ten years, if ten peaceful years are allowed to our Church and State without any intestine convulsion, which, earnestly as we may hope and pray for, who dare promise? Is there hope but that

> Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit
> Nos nequiores, mox daturos
> Progeniem vitiosiorem;

that the Heathenism which we have been engendering, will not yield a more fearful death-crop? Amid much of fear, there are some cheering signs; some streaks of light amid gathering darkness; but if we are to escape political, it must be by a moral and religious, revolution; a revolution, not changing our Church, a word in her Liturgy, or a phrase in her Articles, but changing us, conforming us to her spirit, breathing fresh life into us, teaching us to act up to her rules in the three great Christian duties, prayer, fasting, almsgiving, and all which these branch out into and include, dependence upon God, denial to self, love to men;—a revolution, "not coming with observation," but wrought by that Blessed and renewing Spirit, Whose "kingdom is within" us. Of a dawn of that morning there are faint but cheering glimmerings; some, though among the rich they seem to be few, have struck into the right path of self-sacrificing charity; anonymous gifts of £6000, £5000, £4000, and £1000, mentioned in the Metropolis-Churches Reports, "furnish examples," as it says, "which it is hoped may be speedily followed." It may lawfully be hoped, since our hope is not in man

but in God: it is not whether the tide be setting in rapidly or no, whether we be moving slowly and toilsomely up hill or no, but in which direction we be going, up hill or down it, whether the tide be ebbing or be turned. At the turning, it will be scarcely perceptible which way the tide is moving; but, so it have turned, the barren shore will in time be covered; dry and prickly is the plant, which is the first token of vegetation and life among the recovered sands, but it is a sure herald that where fresh life has been infused, however meagre, flocks will one day find pasture there; we may be moving slowly, yet if the eye is looking upwards, we may hope to reach our home. But the very condition of our restoration is the acknowledgment of our deficiencies.

It is but the very beginning of a new course, upon which we are setting out, fettered by the iron chains of evil habits, universal to us; and as we could not have set out one step of ourselves, no neither can we of ourselves add one step to those we have taken; much less, persevere to the end. The course upon which we were, and as a nation, still are, was preference of self to God; the course, of which we trust there are some slender beginnings, is the preference of God to self. The habits of any luxurious nation, like ourselves, are to spend largely upon self; self is its idol; "luxury," says Bishop Horsley, "renders every man selfish upon principle;" our own houses, our grounds, if we have them, our own persons, tables, furniture, equipage, attendants, are its first object; the first thing to be regarded, that which is essential to us; it is taken for granted that these are to be provided with "all that the soul lusteth after;" no matter for expense here, if the eye be but gratified; nay in very wantonness, people multiply things which no ways minister unto their comfort, as when they cover their tables with prints, which

scarce occupy a passing gaze, or with ornaments, which they never regard, and which are an encumbrance. When all these things have been heaped around, then people think it a great thing, if some petty sum be spared to Almighty God. It matters not, they in fact say, how mean the buildings to His Great Name are; ornaments in His Temple, its architecture, its windows, its Altar, are waste; they have discovered,—at least they act as though they understood,—that the ways of the world and of the Church should be different, and evince their sense of the difference by sparing no cost or luxury upon self, and thinking nothing too mean and poor for the service of their Maker; so many Churches are needed, that it is to be held wrong to expend money upon ornament, on tower or spire; it is held out as an inducement to give that "the strictest economy is to be observed;" that "the sacred character" is, at best, to be "combined with economy;" it is made a condition that nothing be "expended on superfluous ornament;" there are, it is said, so many calls, that nothing beyond what is barely necessary should be employed on each; and people forget, the while, that the one ever-exhausting, unceasing, call, which dries up and drains off all their charities, is self in some changing form of luxury.

The Catholic (i. e. the primitive, Apostolic) model upon which our forefathers, amid partial darkness, yet acted, was, preference of God to self. Austere to themselves, they sought their glory in the glory of God; their joy, their glory, their happiness, was to see the holy pile, year by year, rise heavenwards, although themselves hoped to be translated to Paradise ere it was completed; when reared, they filled it with painted windows, that no object of the outward world might intrude upon their devotions, but even the very instruments of transmitting light might convey

spiritual light and edification also; they lived in its services, its walls were their home, ever open to receive them; through it they were to be transmitted, they hoped, to their long home; and so as the house of their God, it was their joy to ornament it, rather than to dwell in "ceiled houses" themselves. What is first in a man's affections finds no lack; a narrow income is found large enough to supply his chief, first, wishes: year by year, they spend or accumulate upon this one object, until we may be amazed how with such means they have wasted or heaped together so much. Any one almost would be surprised and startled to find how much himself had spent in twenty years, of how much expenditure, which passed away unperceived, he has to give account to God, when his stewardship is to be given up. Be God the first object, and in this wealthy nation, we should have enough and to spare; in whatever degree He becomes such to us, our wants will be mitigated; unless He, in some degree, become such, we are lost. When people in earnest seek Him first, they will be surprised to find how much of the wants of their poor neighbours they might readily supply; how many thousands in this wealthy nation might annually build a Church to Almighty God, and not miss what they expend, so that they at the same time somewhat retrenched expenditure upon self: or, since the very rich will mostly be the last to "enter the kingdom of heaven" or take the road thither, how by saving out of a moderate income (professional or other) a few hundreds yearly, an individual might, in the course of not many years, provide a village Church[f]; if persons had but £10 to spare annually,

[f] Littlemore Church, in the diocese of Oxford, whose walls are built, as befits a Church which is to remain until our Lord comes, and dug deep so as to be founded on a rock, cost somewhat under £1000. It contains 200.

ten such persons might in ten years, provide one[g]: would we, in providing for our families according to S. Augustine's[h] beautiful suggestion, regard Christ as an additional son, and give to Him, Who is "more to us than ten sons," our only Hope for ever, give to His poor, the portion of one child, what wants might not, in this wealthy nation, be supplied, and our families be not the poorer, but enriched, in that they had (to speak reverently) enrolled among them their Redeemer, in Whose "hands are all things in heaven and in earth!" Were the offertory restored, how might the increase of our stores be consecrated, our poor provided for, our rich gain almost insensibly the true treasure!

The restoration depends much upon the Clergy; there is much feeling left in our nation; much susceptibility ready to answer the call; much high principle, which would be ready to sacrifice self, as soon as the thought of such sacrifices being acceptable should be brought before it; we must preach self-denial, and practise what we preach; preach, not once or twice, but again and again, until people's minds become familiarized to the thought, that we have responsibilities towards those, by whose labour our comforts are supplied; that we have no right to draw human souls together to "minister to us in carnal things," our manufactures, our commerce, our fuel, our clothing, our ease in our places of resort, and not minister to them, in what measure we may, "in spiritual

[g] This is being acted upon.

[h] Serm. 355. (al. de div. 49.) S. Aug. is explaining why he refused certain gifts to the Church, as of one who had disinherited his son; he adds, "But if he did, what I often exhorted to; has he one son, let him account Christ a second; has he two, let him account Christ a third; has he ten, let him make Christ the eleventh, and I will accept it."

things." The rich have a duty wherever they go; they have no right to draw people to our vast metropolis, and, because they spend but a portion of their year there, profess that it is not their home, and as far as in them lies, destroy those whom they in fact brought there, but "for whom Christ died;" we have no right to go to seek health or refreshment, and though the village thus swells into a town with tens of thousands, profess that it is not our concern, because we are only a portion of the multitude who draws them thither; and so "follow that multitude to do evil." We have no right to wander about at will, as though we were our own lords and had not all One Lord, content ourselves to find houses and Churches, and full supply of all our needs, wherever we go, and regarding as aliens in whom we have no interest, those through whose agency God supplies all our wants, lest we be ourselves considered as aliens in His sight, Whose people we treat as aliens; we have no right to draw large incomes from places where we reside or reside not, and be careless of their welfare through whose labour "the earth yields her increase" or manufactures their wealth. These things we must repeat constantly; and if the many refuse to hearken, we shall have saved our own souls and those to whom God giveth "ears to hear." Least of all must we flatter ourselves or others on any increase which may be made in our contributions; our self-gratulation wastes us, and makes us stand still or fall back, instead of pressing onward; rather our habit of mind, in giving, should be to confess our unworthiness to give to His Great Name, our sinfulness in former or present wasting of His goods, the poorness of our offerings, the worthlessness of the offerers; seeing and acknowledging the extent of our misery, and so substituting for boastfulness, humility; for self-gratulation, abasement; that so "for our shame we may have double.

and for confusion rejoice in our portion:" and, in this spirit, praying God in the words of the most penitential Psalm, "Be favourable and gracious unto Zion, build Thou the walls of Jerusalem; *then* shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offerings and whole burnt-offerings; then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine Altar." As God looks graciously upon His Church, we may hope that He will look upon us in it, and "accept the work of our hands," in itself worthless, for His sake, Whose Body the Church is.

Feast of the
Presentation of Christ in the Temple,
1841.

A

SERMON.

CHRIST, THE SOURCE AND RULE OF CHRISTIAN LOVE.

S. John xiii. 34, 35.

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another.

To-day is the festival of the Apostle of love: the "beloved disciple" of Him Who was and is Love; the Apostle who was, in an especial way, the beloved of Him, Who "loved His own which were in the world," and "loved them unto the end;" him did He choose in an eminent degree to declare to us love, that having drank in His love from His Saviour's breast whereon he lay, he might impart it to us; the love of God, and the love of man; the forecoming love of God to man, His inworked love in man to Himself, issuing forth in deeds of love to our fellow-men, whom, with us, He has loved. He, Who "distributeth to every man severally as He wills," and "assigns to every man his

work" in His great household, seems to have observed the same economy in inspiration also, and even when filling with the Holy Ghost the inspired ministers of His word, and making them His own oracles, to have allotted to each his especial office;—to the beloved Disciple to impart that which he had received, making him the herald of that love, wherewith he had been loved. He, whom our Lord so loved, that, loving all, it seemed as though He loved him alone; he, whom He took to be the son of His mother, giving him unto her, as it were, instead of Himself, when His earthly relations to her were now about to cease,—well might he speak of love; for he "spake of that which" he "knew," and "testified that" he "had heard:" and well were it for us, whom God has permitted on this day to assemble on a work of love, to listen to his teaching, and honour him on this his holy day, by obeying the commandment which he delivers to us from his and our Lord.

For him then it was reserved to declare what God in Himself is, "God is love,"—not holiness or justice, though holy and just, but love; yet not loving only, but Love, though a Love, which cannot endure iniquity. The chief subject of his Epistle is love; the love of God towards us, in the death of Him Who was God; "hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us[a];"—its source in us, from Him, "herein is

[a] 1 John iii. 16.

love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins;" "we love Him because He first loved us[b];" the means, whereby the love of God is upheld in us, by keeping God's commandments and loving our brethren; "if we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us[c];" the nature of that love, "not in word but in truth[d];" not in professions of charity, or high-sounding speeches, or liberality in words, but in deeds, and specially in such deeds as we are this day called upon to do, deeds of compassion to them who have need; "whoso hath this world's good and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" lastly, the privileges of that love; that thereby we "abide in the light[e];" "we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren[f];" "to assure our hearts before God[g];" to "have confidence in the Day of Judgment, because as He is, so are we in this world[h]," i. e. doing good, as He doth it, largely, unsparingly, regardless of unthankfulness, persevering, unwearied, seeking out every where whereon to bestow itself, finding entrance if not in one way yet in another, loving to communicate itself, shining alike on the evil and the good—this love is a proof that we retain our

[b] 1 John iv. 19. [c] iv. 12. [d] iii. 17, 18. [e] ii. 10. [f] iii. 14. [g] 19. [h] iv. 17.

birth of God; it hath the knowledge of God; "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God[i];" it is dwelling in God, and His Indwelling in us, "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him[k];" and, with God, it hath eternal life dwelling in us, for God is life and love, life and love eternal, eternally abiding in them who live and love in Him, whose life and love He is.

What then is the nature of that love, which the Holy Ghost by St. John so commendeth to us? what is it, which hath these promises annexed to it even in this life; the knowledge of Him Who is Love; the indwelling of His Love, the Son of His Love by His Spirit, the fruits of the Cross of Christ, of His love wherewith "He loved us, and gave Himself as a propitiation for our sins;" of the love of the Father "Who gave His Only-Begotten Son, that whoso believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life?"

What is Christian love? is it the same in kind as God's ancient people may have had, before the Son of God came in the flesh to make us "sons of God;" before, as man, the Holy Ghost descended upon Him, that we also might become in Him "an habitation of God through the Spirit?" are we safe while our love exceeds not the love of the Scribes and Pharisees, as we know we are not, unless our righteousness exceed theirs?

Our Lord, in the text, decides this for us; He

[i] 1 John iv. 7. [k] 16.

tells us, that it is a *new* command which He has given us, "a new commandment I give unto you;" that it shall be *the* mark of His disciples, "by this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." It must, even from this, be something above the love of the Old Testament; else had it not marked us out at once to be His disciples, as distinct from the Jews among and with whom the first Christians dwelt, and from whom our Lord was now separating His Apostles, as the foundations, in Himself, of the Christian Church: it must be "new" because He calls it so.

It suffices not then for the meaning of the word "new" that our Christian love should differ from that of the Jews, in that the Christian Name comprehends all people, nations, and languages, whereas the Jews were but one people: the command is that we "love one another;" Christians then being one family, there were nothing new and surpassing in this, that all Christians should "love one another," as all Jews were commanded to "love one another." The family is larger; still the love between the members of one family is of the same sort, whether they be more or fewer. It suffices not, as others have said, that it is an ever-renewed command; our Lord says not only "renewed," but "new;" nor again, as an ancient Bishop[1] says, that "love is renewing, makes us new men, makes us heirs of the New Testament, worthy to

[1] S. Augustine, on the passage.

sing the new song of the Lamb." Love doth so, as being that whereby the Holy Spirit dwelleth in us, yet doth not this shew, wherein the "commandment" is "new." In like way, if it be said that this love belongeth to the new man, as new-created in Christ Jesus, derived from the "new Spirit of love, as the old from fear," this also is partly true, but not all. The full truth, as our Lord explains His own meaning, contains all these, and goes beyond them; the command is new, because it is a new kind of love which He enjoins; a love peculiar to the Gospel, as flowing from His Cross; and so a love inwrought in us as renewed by His Spirit, and renewing us by being inwrought, and embracing not one or other, but all whom His Blood hath redeemed.

Yet the love of the Old Testament was a lofty love, a righteous love; it flowed from the love of God: "the stranger that dwelleth among you—thou shalt love as thyself—I am the Lord thy God," are the very words of the Old Testament; our Lord bears witness to its teaching, "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment; and the second is like this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And these two commandments thus knit together, and each securing the real obedience to the other, He pronounces to be the very centre and substance of the Law and the Prophets; "on

these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." It was no common love of man which was to flow from such intense, entire, love of God as this; no common duty which was thus joined on, as *like* to the love of God. It must have been a love of man for God's sake, else had it not been a religious love; it had been a natural earthly affection, not an act of piety and duty to God. Its rule is perfect, as far as it goes; "thou shalt love him as thyself;" it forbids every thing we would not have done to ourselves; it enjoins every thing which we could desire for ourselves, if we were in our neighbour's stead. Thus essential in its character, as the very key-stone of the ancient dispensation; holy in its source, as coming from God; in its end, as loving man for the sake of God; in its measures, as giving a strict rule of right, and shutting out all selfish preference of self, what was there lacking to it, or how could our Lord's command of love be a "new commandment?"

Because the commandment of the Old Testament, though "holy, just, and good," was only such; it was a love founded on justice rather than on mercy; it forbade doing what we would not have done; it bade to be done what we would have done; but it flowed within these channels; self was still the measure of its duty; it had no expansive force to carry it beyond these bounds, bearing richness and mercy wherever it spread; its pat-

tern and rule was man, not God; it said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," not "Thou shalt love him, as thy heavenly Father loves him."

And herein was it chiefly that the commandment of our Lord was a "new commandment," that it proposed a new pattern, a new measure. Christian love is not the love of man for man; it is a Divine love, after a Divine pattern, and so, widening and deepening endlessly; it is to love man with the love wherewith God has loved him. For so our Lord goes on to say, "that ye love one another; *as* I have loved you, that ye also love one another." It is a love, then, which as far as man may come up to it, is formed upon, and to realize the love of the Redeemer; it is, as being members of Him, and so partakers of His Spirit, and capable of a Divine love, to love His other members, *as* He loved them, with a love which shall bear some likeness to His love for them.

How then did Christ love us? Need one at any time ask Christians how their Saviour loved them? need one especially ask them now, when we have just been praising Him, in that being "God, and with God," He "for us and for our salvation, became man;" in that, being Lord of all, He took upon Him "the form of a servant;" having "the glory of the Father," He took upon Him our shame; holy, He took upon Him "the likeness of" our "sinful flesh;" rich in the love of the Ever-blessed Trinity, for our sakes "He became

poor ;" full, " He emptied Himself ;" " the Everlasting Son of the Father" did not " abhor" to be born anew in time of " the Virgin's womb ;" He, the immortal, " overcame," by tasting it, " the sharpness of death ;" He, Whom the Father loveth ineffably, as He the Father, bore for us the wrath of the Father, Whom He loved. As saith the Apostle, " Being in the form of God, He thought it nothing to be desired to remain equal with God, but emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man ; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself" (yet farther), " and became obedient unto death, and that the death of the Cross," seeking in each act of humiliation a lower depth, whereunto for us to abase Himself. " Ye know," he saith again, " the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He were rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich[m]." " He, Who knew no sin, was made sin for us ;" " it pleased the Lord to bruise Him ; He put Him to grief ; the Lord laid upon Him the iniquity of us all."

Our Lord then (to speak reverently on such a subject, yet as ancient Fathers[n] speak) " loved us not *as* Himself, but more than Himself." For us He left the worship and praise of the Heavenly Host, to seek His one lost sheep in this our wilder-

[m] 2 Cor. viii. 9. [n] See note A at the end.

ness; for us, He endured the humility of the Incarnation, "the contradiction of sinners against Himself," "the blasphemy of the multitude," to be rejected by His own unto whom He came; to be betrayed by a disciple; to be dishonoured, as though He Himself blasphemed His Father Whom He honoured: He hid not His face from shame and spitting; "the reproaches of them which reproached" His Father "fell on" Him. What should one more say? It behoves us to speak reverently and warily in these depths of mystery; yet this we must say, that of all these sufferings we know the outward face only; we know that they must have been far other than we can think of, that all these sufferings were heightened, perhaps had their real character from that which we know so little of—His holiness, as resulting from His Divinity, which enabled His human nature to bear its load of suffering. What to His holiness must have been the approach of His fallen Angel Satan, to tempt Him? What to be accounted a blasphemer of His Father? What to see those harden themselves, whom He came to save? What, to know that His word must at the last Day condemn of those whom, in their own day, He "would have gathered under" His "wings" and they "would not?" What that mysterious agony, which wrung from Him those heavy words, "Father, if it be possible, let this Cup pass from Me; nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt?"

Such, then, Brethren, is the length and breadth and depth of our "new commandment;" its pattern, our loving Master, Who was God and man; its foundation, His inestimable love in our redemption; its extent, His infinity: it was given to us in sight of His Cross; when the traitor had just gone forth to deliver Him into the hands of sinners, and, with the traitor, all which was not love, was gone forth; it was given, while He was even yet speaking of that Death whereby God should be glorified in the Son, and so should Himself glorify Him when He had first been consecrated through sufferings. Such was it with regard to Him; and as to us, it was given, the one command amid all those gracious promises, of the aid of the other Comforter, which should make even the loss of the sight of our Saviour, gain; of abiding in His love, as He in His Father's love; His abiding in us for ever; the abiding of our fruit; the Indwelling of the Son with the Father by the Spirit; His invisible coming to us; His peace left with us: amid all these gracious assurances, wherein He seems to pour out all the treasures of His love, He gives this one command, with the promise, "whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My Name, I will give it you;" He gives it as His one command; "*This is My* commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you."

And, in each place, our Lord speaks it in regard to suffering; in the text, of those sufferings whereby "the Son of Man" should be "glorified, and God"

be "glorified in Him;" and again°, "This is My commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you;" that is, I am about to lay down My life for you; and thus have made you My friends; I have admitted you to partake of My counsels, My love, My Self; I have made you, in your measure, such as I am, since a friend beareth a likeness to his friend, is one with him; if ye would continue My friends, ye must be like Me, love as I have loved, do as I have done, be ready to suffer, one for the other, as I have suffered; the disciples of the Crucified must not "count" aught of their own, their wealth, ease, comfort, nay their very lives, "dear unto themselves," if by parting with them, they may do good to their brethren; none of these things are their own but His Who bought them with His own precious Blood, that whether they live or die, they should be His; if they themselves, soul, body, spirit, are not their own but His, Who created, redeemed, regenerated them, how should aught besides? how should they withhold from Him what is His? how should they not gladly join their own sufferings with His, for those who with them, by virtue of the same Blessed Sacrifice and Sacrament, are also His?

And thus the beloved disciple explains His Lord's words, "Hereby perceive we love, because He laid

° John xv. 12—14.

down His life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren[p]," that is, as His love passeth into us, so ought it to bear like fruit in us; the disciples of Him Who bare the sorrows of us all, should be ready to bear each other's sorrows; the disciples of Him Who withheld nothing from us, should themselves keep back nothing; the followers of Him, Who gave Himself for us that we might live, should gladly give their earthly lives, if so they might win those for whom with us He died.

And as our Lord calls this "His command," so St. Paul speaks of obedience to it as the fulfilment of His law; "Bear ye one another's burthens, and so fulfil *the law of Christ*;" and of him the Holy Ghost witnesseth, that "in his flesh he filled up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ for His body's sake, which is the Church;" that is, though all meritorious sufferings were Christ's alone, yet did He bequeath to His Church a precious gift, which was to belong to all His more chosen vessels, even a certain residue of His own sufferings; their sufferings for Him and His body the Church He joins to His, and accounts them His own; yea they are His own, since He is persecuted in His members, He hungers, thirsts, is sick and in prison, in His members; the marks of the stripes, and the iron bonds, are "the marks of the Lord Jesus," which they "bare about" them. And they rejoice, not in suffering only like Him,

[p] 1 John iii. 16.

but that they are partakers of *His* sufferings; "that I may know," says St. Paul, "the fellowship of His sufferings," and, "as the sufferings of Christ abound in us[q];" and St. Peter, "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings[r]:" they are Christ's own sufferings, which overflow into them as true branches of the True Vine; His sufferings, in that they are borne through His Spirit, in Him, for Him, by Him; they are fruits, to the end of time, of His Cross; they are images, and shadows, and reflections of that Cross, shining in its glory, streaming down some of its lights upon us, tokens of Its Presence and Power, witnesses that we are yet the same Church, for whom Christ suffered.

Well then may it be called "a new commandment," since its character is derived from the very depths of that new disclosure of God's mercy in Christ, which had been but dimly shadowed out in the law; which "Prophets and kings desired to see, and saw not;" which in times past was hidden from men and Angels. The new commandment belongs to that "new and better covenant, established upon better promises," whereof our Lord is Mediator, and not man; that "new covenant" in which God's commandment should no longer be an outward letter which killeth, but in which He would "put His laws into their minds," and they should be the law and rule of

[q] 2 Cor. i. 5. [r] 1 Pet. iv. 13.

their minds; a new covenant, in which we "have confidence to enter into the holiest by the Blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is His flesh[s];" a new covenant, in which "old things are passed away and all things are become new;" it belongs to us, as we have been stripped of the old man, and are become new creatures, having been renewed, re-generated, re-created in Christ Jesus; bearing a "new Name," even our Redeemer's, which in Holy Baptism was named upon us; it is given to us, with a new Spirit, new powers, new hopes, new faith, new capacity to love, in that we have been so loved.

And well did the first disciples fulfil this new law and our Lord's prediction, "by this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." What is the history of the Apostles but the history of a sharing of their Saviour's sufferings for His Body's sake? What of the Bishops for centuries, but that, following the steps of the Chief Bishop Whom they represented, they were delivered to death and suffering, that the other sheep might escape? What of the whole extension of the Gospel in all lands, but of the good seed sown every where by Christian blood, harrowed in by Christian suffering, and so yielding a harvest of souls won to Christ? What of the whole conduct of Christians to each other, but of

[s] Heb. x. 19, 20.

who has been at all consulted, knows cases in which persons who were going over from Ultra-Protestantism, have been thankful to be stayed, and found their rest in the true doctrines of our Church. I might say, that in any case which was not already gone too far, and in some which had gone extremely far, the true exhibition of the character of our Church, and their consequent duties to her and privileges in her, have been, by God's blessing, the effectual means of their recovery. Whoever have given themselves time to become acquainted with her, have rested in her. Those about whom we have had or have most reason to be anxious, have not been persons formed by our teaching, but are such as have struck out views for themselves, or have engrafted any thing we have taught, upon habits and thoughts which they had previously formed, or have been stayed for the time from Romanism by our teaching, or been acted upon by other influences and sympathies, or know no more of it than they who oppose it mostly do, gathering what they do know from common report, and carrying it out in an unreal and impatient spirit. I may say at once, that we have as yet no fears for those, who have been trained by the writings and teaching of those, whom,—one indirectly, the other directly,—God has chiefly em-

to Mr. S. p. 6—8.) An Oxford Tradesman ascribes his to his private study of Hammond, Thorndike, &c. the boy at Shrewsbury School was in habits of intercourse with Roman Catholics.

ployed to form men's minds within our Church, so long as that Church, by no overt acts of herself or her rulers, becomes other than she is.

And surely now, my Lord, when the very atmosphere is full of controverted doctrine, when the very periodical or daily press teems with discussions on the Church, Unity, Apostolical Succession, and, alas! on our holy Mysteries themselves, discussing all the details of doctrine or discipline wherein we are at issue with Rome; when people are taught by those most opposed to Catholic teaching to decide upon these points for themselves, and it is taken for granted that any one who has access to Holy Scripture is competent to decide upon them—it is too much to visit upon us any defections which there may be. Persons need not have recourse to the writings of any of us, to become familiar with these topics: I trust, that if they did, they would treat them with a more reverent spirit, and so more safely to themselves than is now too often done. It is not by us, that the young men in this place have now for some months had the subject of Romanism brought before them, or been taught to identify it with some whom they respect or love. The very clamour against "Popery," within or without the Church, is every where tempting persons' curiosity, and enlisting their sympathies; they who know nothing about the "Tracts" have their thoughts turned to Rome, and are interested in her, and study the works of Roman controversialists;

My brethren, we must speak plainly in this matter; we are not what our forefathers were; we boast of the light of the Gospel which is shed around us, but it is to us a powerless light, it warms us not to those deeds of self-denial and love to which they were trained, amid much comparative darkness. If the men of Nineveh shall rise up against the generation which saw the miracles of our Lord, how much more shall our forefathers, who, living in what we call darkness, did the deeds of light, which we do not! This very city, wherein this house of God stands, exhibits in the very face of heaven the deeds of our forefathers, and our own. It is sad to behold it from the fair eminence of the neighbouring heights, whither its rich men have for health or comfort so often retreated, to see it, as they too must see it, set as it were in the garden of the Lord, one part of it thickly studded with churches, whose towers or spires pierce the skies, and bear witness to the deeds of our fathers,—and then to look on to a long waste of human habitation, unsanctified by the presence of a single temple of our God, or with one, here and there, as a resting-place amidst a desert, and to see therein our deeds. It is sad to see how every portion of *their* city is hallowed by the presence of temples of their God, rich, lofty, more capacious than was needed absolutely to contain their inhabitants, so that this

ancient city was the "city of Churches[z];" and how ours seems to betoken (God forbid it should continue so) who has been our god, "the god of this world:" how in theirs their churches, as their hopes, rose to heaven; how ours creeps along the ground, a low dark mass of earthly building, the workshops of our gains; or if aught rises heavenwards, they are the instruments of this world's wealth, the masts of our vessels; as though we would say, in the very presence of God, to Whom our forefathers reared those hallowed piles, "these be *thy* gods, O Israel." It is sad to see how a part of your Cathedral, destroyed in civil war to which God once left us, still, after two centuries, remains unrestored, bearing witness against us, century after century, that we come not up to the measure of our fathers; we not only do not deeds like theirs, we do not even sustain the monuments of piety which they left us. But edifices such as these, it will be said, are superfluities; be it so; only let us measure ourselves by the same rule whereby we measure our service to God, and then speak of "superfluities" in the honour and service of Almighty God, when we have cut off all from ourselves; let us not be sparing and niggard in the worship of our Creator, and lavish upon self!

[z] Chatterton also says,

Thys quaintissed place so gloryous
Seemeynge alle chyrches joyned yn one guylde.
Parlt. of Sprytes, near the end.

But what shall we say then of *necessities?* What will ye plead, when it appears that in three parishes alone in this wealthy city, nearly 26,000 persons, (such were the wants ten years ago, and now through the increase of population employed in the increase of your wealth the wants too are much increased[a],) in three parishes alone of this wealthy city, nearly 26,000 undying souls are left to pass year by year from their cradle to their graves, are left, like beasts, to perish, outcasts from the Church and from the gate of heaven, left, at best, to find shepherds for themselves, as they may, but the most to fall an easy prey to Satan, because none has fenced them round in the fold of Christ's Church; left to live and die in carelessness and sin, because they who could have helped them would not, they to whose love and care our loving Lord committed them, loved them not?

What, when this single Church, containing scarce 1,000 souls, and these mostly persons connected with

	population	now probably	Church room	addition since	deficit in 1831	deficit in 1841
S. Paul's	12,641	16,000	965		9,746	13,105
S. Philip and S. Jacob	19,663	22,163	3,800		8,263	10,763
S. James	11,488	12,988	1,200	1000	7,888	6,388
	43,792	51,151	5,965	1000	25,897	30,256

Two Churches, which the body, holding the patronage of St. Philip and St. Jacob, propose to build, containing 2,400 persons, would reduce its deficiency considerably; but while these are being built, besides the continual increase of the population, "a large accession will be taking place through a large cotton manufactory lately established, and now quite in its infancy."

the wealthier sort, is hitherto the only provision for a parish containing (ten years [b] past) nearly 13,000, now too probably 16,000 souls, and the good work, which you are called upon to aid—good and well-pleasing to God as far as it goes, and *as a* beginning—will, when accomplished, extend the blessings of the Gospel to 2,000 of your brethren, yet will it leave above 13,000 still destitute?

What shall we say, when in this worldly city, with such means at its command, the way to heaven seems (as far as man's will goes) barred to the poor man; scarcely any place of worship of any kind in the whole city receives the prayers of the poor, or is gladdened by the face of a poor man; the Church, the common refuge and Mother of all who will come to her, is not open to them; what are called free seats are occupied mostly by the servants of the rich; the poor are shamed to enter in, where so few, such as they, can find entrance! As though we had not all one Father! as though we were not all redeemed by the same Blood! as though we were not to appear before the same Judge, among other sins of our people, to account for the neglect

[b] At the census of 1831 the "in-parish" of S. Paul's, in which the Church stands, was 9,146; of whom even at the insufficient rate of providing room in God's House for one third at once, 6,251 were excluded; the "out-parish" of Montpellier containing 3,495, now probably 6 or 7,000 souls, is hitherto wholly destitute. The new Chapel is intended for the out-parish, but to contain only about 700.

of His poor members—as though the prayers of the poor to Him, "Who being rich, for our sakes became poor," were not the wealth of any nation! as if we meant to have no share in our Lord's blessing, that "the poor have the Gospel preached to them!"

And why is this? why this difference between our fathers' deeds and ours? why while they erected Churches and provided ministers for each little groupe (if it so happened) of 1, or 2, or 400 souls[c], do we leave our twenty thousands unheeded? Lack we the means? Alas! this wealthy city might readily supply all the wants and to spare, without even, on this world's calculation, missing what they bestow. The Christian knows that such scattering would increase their stores. The goodly houses which encircle this Church, and shew so fair, shew no lack of means; your warehouses crowded with this world's goods, your shops filled with all manner of luxuries, imply no want of means; the costly building even now rising in the town blended with this, for ends which end with this world, implies no lack of means. The difference lies not in our means, except that ours are far greater than our forefathers' who built those goodly piles, but in our habits; they "sought first

[c] The population of S. Werburgh was, in 1831, 100; All Saints, 180; S. Mary Le Port, 400; besides these, three Churches have been razed, within the memory of man, and the parishes which belonged to them joined on to others.

the kingdom of God and His righteousness," whereinto they are now entered in rest, we "the things" which "the Gentiles sought;" they confessed Christ in deeds, we in words; they had a care for Christ's poor, we for our families; they practised self-denying charity, men now think it much, if they give out of superfluities; they thought it their highest glory to glorify God, we to aggrandize self; their habits were what we should think an austere and rude and self-denying simplicity, ours a soft and elegant and self-indulgent luxury; luxuries, which they knew not, we have made our essential comforts, and year by year heap up new luxuries; and furnish our houses with expenses which they knew not of, and cover our tables with needless profusion, and should think the fare of our forefathers coarse and hard; and ornament our houses with refinements, and our persons with "gold and costly array;" and we fence ourselves round with elegancies, until there is no way for the breath of Heaven to pass through, and breathe into our souls the spirit of charity; and if a somewhat larger sum be needed for some urgent Christian purpose, we give our own petty contributions, and make up the larger portion with the sale of baubles, (confessing that we cannot obtain what we want from men's Christian love,) and call this multiplying of our luxuries Christian charity! We have admitted the moth and rust among our treasures, so that we have none wherewith to make an offering

to God, or wherewith to purchase eternal treasures, or have not left ourselves the hearts to make it. We give guineas when we should give tens, and tens for hundreds; and hundreds are given, when thousands might be given, and yet abundance left; alas! would one need not say, when tens of thousands might be readily spared, people grudge themselves their rich reward, and think well of themselves for some costless offering. But which were most like Him, Who for our sakes had not where to lay His head? which were most conformed to the likeness of their Crucified Lord? which most loved their brethren, *as* He loved them? which have most treasure laid up with Him against the Great Day?

This cannot last; either our luxuries must destroy us, as they have every luxurious nation before us, or we must unlearn our luxuries, in order to learn the Cross and Christian charity; we must learn to sacrifice self, in order to Christianize our land, or the Heathenism of our land will destroy us. You have, in this place, already had an awful warning of God's displeasure upon past neglect; the wealth, which a few years ago was here burnt up[d], because out of it none had been spared to extend the blessings of the Gospel to the poor, would more than have provided this whole city

[d] The loss by fire and pillage in the riots of Bristol were assessed at £100,000, which is now being levied by annual instalments.

with Churches, worthy of God's great Name; you have, in the flames which were kindled in the very heart of your city, consuming the idol on which men's hearts were set, that themselves might escape, had an earnest of that punishment which all are heaping up for themselves, who neglect Him; in their extinction, a token of His long-suffering: but beware how ye tempt that long-suffering; recollect that there is a Judgment, of which all temporal judgments are but forerunners; a fire, which God will not extinguish; suffering, of which there is no mitigation, no end; a doom, in which there is no Intercessor; and that these are especially reserved for such as, in this life, shewed no mercy to Christ's poor; that while fornicators, unjust, covetous, have no portion (we know) in the kingdom of heaven, yet in our Lord's own description of the Great Day, the sin, which He singles out for condemnation, is neglect of Him in His poor and suffering members.

But though we dare not leave out of sight God's terrors, which He so often sets before us, yet on this festival of the Apostle of love, in this season of our Saviour's love and great humility, He appeals rather to our love for Him, to lead us to this act of love to our brethren.

If, then, we "would be" as He is in this world, if we would follow His steps as our loving Master, if we would, not among men only but before His Father and the Holy Angels, be acknowledged as

His disciples, if we would receive a disciple's reward, if we would hear the gracious words, "Forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me," there is but one way, one strait narrow way; the way of self-denying charity. Gifts, which are given out of our abundance, may gain us credit among men, they may shew a kindly spirit, such as the Jews were bid to cherish, but they are not tokens of Christian love. Alas! would that we were not put to shame by the very Jews! would that our righteousness came up even to theirs, and that we provided for our poor as they even now do for theirs! would that we, who are God's people, came up to them, who for the time are "not His people!" Of old they bestowed year by year one tenth of their substance on the poor, beyond the one tenth which they gave to God's Priests; yearly they retained but four fifths for themselves; one fifth of the increase wherewith God had blessed them, they gave to Him in His ministers and His poor; and each third year, they gave a third tenth to God.

And shall we then, on whom the very Name of the Son of God has been called, be content with a Jewish charity? shall we, on whom the light and love of the Gospel have been poured, fall short of the measures of the Law? have we no faith, no eyes to see, no hearts to look for, heavenly treasures? shall we always be so fixed on the things of this passing world, as to have no sense left for the

things of eternity? shall we, year by year, celebrate the festivals of the self-denying love of our Master and only Saviour; year by year, accompany Him in outward gesture from the manger whither He descended from the highest Heavens, to the Cross whence He ascended thither again, and year by year hear Him in word and deed bid us love these our and His brethren *as* He has loved us, and yet go on, year by year, loving—not ourselves, but—the perishable comforts, luxuries, ease, of our perishing frames, and neglecting those whom He has committed to our love, until He come again and require of us an account of our stewardship, and of our deeds of love to those, in whom He bade us shew our love to Him? Shall we go on speaking of His Atoning Sacrifice, but ourselves sacrifice nothing; of His poverty for us, but have ourselves no thought except for this world's riches; of His humiliation for us, but ourselves seek only how to exalt ourselves and our families in this world; of His abandoning all His unspeakable glory, and ourselves seek our glory and credit in this passing scene; of His having "emptied Himself" of His inherent Majesty, and ourselves remain "full?" Not in words but in deeds did He love us, when He came down amid our sin and shame and sufferings, to be hated, scorned, crucified, to bear our sins; not in words but in deed do we hope that He will shew His love, in that Day in which if He

compassioneth us not with His exceeding love, we are undone for ever; not in words then, but in deeds must be the love which we meanwhile shew to Him in His poor; learning, slowly it may be, but day by day, to deny ourselves our own desires, to forego things, in which we should have pleasure, and what tempts the eyes, the taste, the senses; looking not what we can afford to spend upon self, but what we may lawfully deny self; not what additional comforts we may keep around us, but what indulgences which we have, we may part with, that we may give the more unto Him; looking in detail into our expenses, in order warily to cut off superfluities; seeking how our habits may become more simple; parting with luxuries which perish in the using, and which soon must part with us, in order to win the love of God; parting with what you now call comforts, to win the only assured comfort, peace with God and joy in the Holy Ghost, the earnest of acceptance and of everlasting rewards,—parting with earth to win heaven; with things temporal for things eternal, with fading enjoyments for everlasting glory; with things without you, that Christ (as He has promised to those who love) may make His abode *in* you.

Would that God may so stir the hearts of this ancient, and, as I trust, yet understanding city, (though it too has partaken of the slumber which in the last century came over all Christendom,)

that it too (as others[e] have in part done) would consider what is needed to Christianize its inhabitants, count the cost and set itself earnestly to the task, to recover its ancient glory and the favour of God. But meantime, and to prepare for this, sacrifices must be made by individuals; others will catch the flame of charity, but it must be kindled first by the self-denying acts of individuals; think not then of those who do otherwise, as though to wish to be of them; think it not a hard thing, as if all the burthen fell upon a few, and others were exempt: they are exempting themselves not from a burthen, if they saw things truly, but from a blessing; they are denying themselves the reward, which is in store for such as "sow bountifully;" they are exempting themselves from the labour of the seed-time, in order to reap a niggard harvest, where the harvest is joy and peace with God, their Redeemer's love, their Redeemer's praise, the joy of their Lord, eternal, unchanging, never-palling joy, because the joy of the blessed is no changing thing, but God the Unchangeable is Himself their portion and their joy for ever.

With such hopes, self-denial, self-sacrifice, though hard and irksome in itself, will become itself a joy;

[e] e. g. the Ten-Churches-fund in Birmingham and Bethnal-Green; in both cases, however, had the population been regarded, rather than what was hoped from our degree of Christian charity, they should have been twenty, in Birmingham (as it now is) probably thirty Churches.

for what joy, even in this life, is there, like the hope that, "loving much," our "sins which are many" shall be "forgiven[f]" for ever; that for the sake of the One Meritorious All-atoning Sacrifice, our petty worthless sacrifices will be accepted there? what joy like the hope that we, though all unworthy, are yet true disciples of our Crucified, Redeeming Lord? that we are being here, in whatever degree, likened to Him; that being made by Him partakers of His self-denying love, we are loved by Him; that keeping His "new commandment," we shall be loved by Him with a new love, an ever new, ever renewing, ever unfading love, for ever; that being "like Him in this world," we "shall have boldness" (as is promised) "in the Day of Judgment;" that following His blessed steps, however faintly, unsteadily, unworthily, yet as upheld by His gracious arm, guided by His promised Comforter, we are indeed His servants, and "where I am, there shall My servant be?"

My brethren, who, if he thought seriously on these things, would not see, that amid the changes and chances of this mortal life, this is the only true abiding joy? who, if he had faith to realize them, would not willingly part with all that he might attain it? Who would not see how this joy must sweeten the bitterness, if it were such, of any sacrifices, self-denials, troubles, sorrows, privations? how much more then, when God gives His faithful servants

[f] Luke vii. 47.

even in this life instalments and earnests of their future joys, Himself, by the secret balm of His Spirit, soothes the sorrows of those "who consider His poor," strengtheneth them when languishing, healeth them in their sickness!

My brethren, if the hope of these joys be such, what must the substance be? if the thought be so cheering, as it flashes across our dim eyes in this our night of heaviness, where our minds are so dulled by sin, what will it be to behold His unveiled face, shining in love and mercy upon us, for having loved those who were His; what to find all the poor offerings of our weak love stored up with Him and accepted by Him, Who gave us what we had to give, gave us the heart to give, gave Himself for us, with Whom all things are given us, and to be repaid in His love, whereby He will fill those who love in Him, more and more with His own Divine Essence, which is Love? If the thought of these things so raise the soul, what must the things themselves be, "which it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive, but which God hath prepared for them that love Him?"

God of His infinite mercy give us grace to be "merciful" that we may "obtain mercy," that we may all hear the compassionate, pardoning words, "Forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

Note A, *page* 29.

The following is the comment of S. Cyril of Alexandria on the text, which has been followed in the preceding Sermon, as alone seeming adequately to give the meaning of the words, which, as is the wont of the Fathers, it presses very closely.

" Rightly saith the divine Paul, ' so then if any one is in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away, lo all things are become new.' For He reneweth and reformeth after a manner to newness of life, and this inaccessible and untrodden by the rest, who love to live after the law and adhere to the commands of Moses. For ' the law maketh nothing perfect,' as is written, but the fullest measure of piety to Godward one may see in the commands of our Saviour. For for this cause Himself also said in this wise, " For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." For we compete not with the Jewish manners; nay, unless we exceedingly surpass the righteousness in the law, never, I deem, shall we enter into the kingdom of heaven. And yet we pronounce not the law given by Moses altogether unprofitable or useless; for it brought in to us what was, although not perfectly, good; yea moreover it is found to be a schoolmaster to the instruction of the Evangelic life; and, through dark figures and types, introducing an image of the true godliness, it engraved in a manner on our thoughts the shadow of the instruction which is through Christ. For for this cause Himself also said, ' For I say unto you, that every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like a rich man, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new

and old.' For it is in truth spiritual and exceeding riches for a man to be well versed in the words given by Moses, and to have the benefits derivable from them treasured up in his mind, so that he take thereto the beauty of the Evangelic instruction, and thus be doubly adorned, by the knowledge both of the ancient and of the new law. Wherefore our Lord Jesus Christ, shewing that this law is better than the ancient law, and that the saving preaching was as yet in a manner inaccessible to those who have their converse in the law, when about to ascend into heaven, layeth beforehand as a sort of foundation and basis of all good, the law of love,—but love not according to the law but above the law; wherefore He saith, 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." But one may say, tell me how He called this a new Commandment, Who said by Moses, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself.' For lo, having set before all others and placed first, as is fit, the love of God, He added, as near to it, that to each other, and conjoined with the love to God, that to each other, in that neither would the love of God otherwise be of the right sort, unless that due to our neighbour followed close by; for we are all brethren, one of another. Wherefore John in his fulness of wisdom well knowing this, and teaching others, saith, 'he who loveth his brother, loveth God also.' How then is it a new command through Christ, although thoroughly prescribed in the old law? But observe how it is guarded; see what He added; for He was not content to say, 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another;' but shewing the newness of this saying, and that the love He spake of had in it somewhat far better than that ancient love one to another, He added straightway, 'as I have loved you.' In order then clearly to know the force of what He said, we must enquire 'how Christ loved

us?' For then may we easily take account of the newness and difference of the commandment now given. He then 'being in the Form of God, thought it nothing to be desired to be equal with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, and that the death of the Cross.' Yea also, 'being rich He became poor,' as Paul again hath attested to us. Seest thou the newness of the love to us? For the law commands to love a brother *as* himself; but the Lord Jesus Christ loved us *more than* Himself; for neither being in the form and equality of God the Father, would He have come down to our lowliness, nor have endured the so bitter death of the flesh for us, nor the Jewish buffetings and shame and mockery and all besides,—not, by enumerating each severally of what was done to Him, to go on to infinity, but—neither 'being rich' would He have 'become poor,' unless He had loved us exceedingly above Himself. Thus He bids us also to be minded, preferring nothing whatever to the love of the brethren, neither glory, nor wealth, nay, nor shrinking, if need be, to go even to the death of the body, that we may gain the salvation of our neighbour, which also the blessed disciples of our Saviour did, and they who followed in their steps, accounting the salvation of others better than their own life, and exhausting every labour and coming into the extremest ills, that they might save the souls of those perishing. Whence Paul saith at one time, 'I die daily;' at another, 'Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?' Our Saviour then enjoined us, as the root of the most perfect piety to God, to cultivate this love above the law, knowing that thus and no otherwise should we be most approved with God, and following out the traces of the beauty of that love, by Him implanted in us, should be ever in the greatest and perfect bliss."

In like way S. Chrysostom, although not so fully;

"How did He call it 'a new commandment,' which was laid down in the Old Testament also? He Himself made it new by the mode; in that He added, 'as I have loved you.' For I have not repaid you a debt for good deserts, before wrought by you, but I myself began. Thus must ye also benefit those ye love, not owing them any thing," [i. e. as Christ died for us when sinners, loving us not according to our deserts, but against our deserts, so also must we others, not because they deserve and have merited our love, but forecoming and anticipating any thing on their part, as He towards us.]

Again Isidore Pelus. (lib. iii. Ep. 410.) "If thou askedst, is it not then said in the Old Testament, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself?' I would say, yea truly did He Himself sanction this also, but afterwards, when Himself was manifested in the flesh, He added somewhat more, saying, 'a new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another, as I have loved you.' For the 'loving' lieth in the Old Testament also, but the 'as I have loved you,' He added, wherefore also He called it 'a new commandment.'"

The same interpretation, with reference to His dying for us, is given by Theodorus Mops. and Ammonius, (in Corderius' Catena in S. Joann.) by Theophylact and Euthymius. Maldonat. ad loc. refers also to Theodorus Heracl. and Leontius, but these do not appear in Corderius ad loc. Of the Latins he quotes Rupertus. In modern times this interpretation has been vindicated, at length, by Knapp, in his scripta varii argumenti, and followed by Lücke and Tholuck ad loc. It also occurs in Beza ad loc. and though less prominently, among others, in Bp. Horsley, Serm. 12.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

GTU Library
3 2400 00781 1213